

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1873.

ART. I.—CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANITY.*

BY PRESIDENT J. WILLIAMSON NEVIN, D.D. LL.D.

As the subject is altogether too broad for anything like full particular discussion, all that I can aim at in the present paper must be an outline simply of its general significance, in the form of a series of brief and comprehensive topics or heads of thought following one another in close logical order, and yet thrown each one more or less upon itself for its own separate evidence and confirmation.

I. The world of nature, made up as it is of innumerable parts, is nevertheless one universal whole, bound and held together through all its parts by the presence of a single Divine idea, which reaches its end in Man. Its constitution in this view is not mechanical, but organic; that is, it is not a scheme of things put together by simply external juxtaposition, but a system of things cohering together inwardly through the power of a common life. It may be regarded as a pyramid, rising through a scale of degrees to its apex; or as an orb, determined from all sides to its centre. In either case the end is the same. Man is the apex and centre, and for this reason also in himself separately considered an epitome, a synopsis or recapitulation.

* A paper prepared, by invitation, for the General Conference of the EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

tulation we may say, of the entire natural creation. He is the last sense of it, and the only true key to its meaning in all its lower forms of existence. So much we are plainly taught by the first chapter of the Book of Genesis. Our own consciousness confirms the lesson; and it has come to be so irradiated now by the light of science, that a man must forfeit all claim to rationality to make it a matter of any serious question or doubt.

II. It is no less plain, however, that man is the consummation of nature in this way, only because he is in himself a great deal more than nature. Nature in its totality looks beyond itself, is a continual *nisus* indeed in its own constitution toward a higher order of existence without which it has no power ever to become complete; and the very fact that it ends in man implies therefore of itself that he is for it at the same time the beginning of that higher existence, and the medium accordingly through which room is made for the work of creation to run its course in new and far more glorious form. Such superiority belongs to him, as we know, in virtue of what he is as mind or spirit, in which are joined together as one the two faculties of the will and the understanding, making him to be in the image and likeness of God, and capable thus of receiving into himself the light of God's truth and the power of God's love as the perfection of his own life. Man in this way exists really in two worlds. In his physical organism he belongs at all points to the world of nature, the system of things seen and temporal, with which he stands in continual communication through his bodily senses. In his spiritual organism he is just as intimately comprehended in the world of spirit, the system of things unseen and eternal, which lies wholly beyond the range of his senses, although it is all the time touching him in fact and making itself felt upon his life in a different way. The difference between these two orders of existence with man, however, is not just that between body and spirit generally considered; for the distinguishing life of man, that by which he differs from the mere animal, is primarily and essentially all in his mind, and only by derivation from thence in his body. But his mind itself is so constituted as to have in it so to speak two different regions, one looking

directly into the natural world through the body and the other opening principally into the spiritual world. Hence properly speaking the difference between the external man and the internal man, some sense of which is found entering into the deeper thought of the world through all ages. It is not simply with the regenerate and righteous that such dualism has place; it belongs to our life here universally.* Man is by his creation at once both spiritual and natural, the denizen of two worlds. That is his distinction from the beast, which is natural only and not spiritual.

III. The dualism here brought into view, it is hardly necessary to say, is not abstract, the conjunction of these two modes of existence in any simply outward relation. It is a distinction which seeks and demands unity, the organization of its two sides into the power of a single concrete life. Neither is there any room for doubt, in regard to the law which should govern the coalescence of the two orders of existence into one. The natural, all know at once, is in order to the spiritual. Here only it is that mind comes to its native home and true destination, by entering into the light of God. The two orders of life are thus of themselves correlated as outward and inward, lower and higher; and this implies of course, that the outward and lower should be ruled in full by the inward and higher. That is the true idea of human culture. That is the only intelligible

* "Das Gesamtverhalten wie das Gesamtgefühl des Menschen bekundet auf unwiderstehliche Art, dass er als '*Fremdling*' sich wisse in dieser Sinnenwelt und dass das Hinausstreben über dieselbe der eigentliche Sinn *aller* eigenthümlich menschlichen Thätigkeit sei. Daher die rastlose Unruhe und der tiefe Zwiespalt, der sein ganzes Wesen durchzieht, indem er jedes Erreichte sofort wieder vor sich verneinen muss; die ungestillte Sehnsucht gerade mitten im kräftigsten Lebensgefühl, die jeder höchsten Freude sogleich sich beimischende ernste Wehmuth, was ebenso die Quelle höchster Erhebung zu Poesie und Religion dem Menschen wird, als umgekehrt den irdisch Gesinnten in die Verödung eines leeren, ewig unbefriedigten Strebens hinauswirft: alles dies ist nur das Zeugniß einer unablässigen *Verneinung* seines gegenwärtigen Zustandes; das heisst aber zugleich: seines substantiellen *Hinausseins* über denselben. Es ist zugleich die thatkräftige Wirkung und unwillkürliche Beglaubigung seines wahrhaftigen, jenseitigen Wesens. Indem der Mensch alles Zeitliche zu einem Ungenügendem herabsetzt, in keinem irdisch erreichten Ziele sich gefangen giebt, verräth er dadurch, eine überzeitliche Macht und eine überzeitliche Bestimmung in sich zu tragen." *From I. H. Fichte's Psychologie.*

end of man's redemption. It is possible for this order to be reversed. The spiritual may be hopelessly turned away from the light of heaven, and merged in the darkness of mere nature. But that in the end is the damnation of hell.

IV. It is not then by any violent sundering of the higher life in man from the lower that he is redeemed and saved. This would be a sublimation of his existence that must destroy at last all its reality. What the case calls for is the full and complete reduction of his lower life to the obedience and service of the higher, the raising of the natural through the spiritual into the harmonious union of the whole man with God. Room is made for this in the twofold constitution of the mind itself, by which it is possible for it to flow down as it were from its own superior region into that which is lower, so as to join them together as with the intimacy of soul and body in the power of one and the same truly spiritual life. It is not simply from itself, however, that any such heavenward determination of the human spirit can come. There must be for this purpose a flowing into it of spirit and life from a yet higher sphere. Only in and by the powers of the heavenly world itself, only through real conjunction with these powers proceeding forth as they do from the Lord of life and glory, is it possible to conceive rationally of the glorification of the natural in man by means of his spiritual in the way here spoken of. The case requires and involves thus in the end an actual coming together of nature and the supernatural, the human and the divine, to make the idea of humanity and the world complete. On this hinges in truth the whole problem of man's salvation.

V. The twofold constitution of man, as we have now had it under consideration, may be taken as a key for the right appreciation in general of the two economies, the two different orders of existence, which are joined into one immediately by means of it in his person. We need no other argument to prove that the two economies are in fact one economy in a deeper and broader view, and that the unity of creation regarded as a whole does not stop by any means with the natural world, but embraces along with this at the same time the entire sense and

significance also of the spiritual world. How indeed can we have any faith in creation at all as the work of Infinite Intelligence and Love under any other view? The two worlds, natural and spiritual, form together one universe; and the union of nature and mind in man serves to show, with a sort of palpable demonstration, how they stand related each to the other in this cosmical whole. Their connection is not one of space or time. It transcends altogether these limitations. The spiritual world is not on the outside of the natural locally, nor does it come after this temporally. It is not a mere sublimation or etherealization in any way of the natural. The relation between the two orders of existence is of one sort rather with that between soul and body in man; two modes of being, which are totally distinct, while yet they work into each other everywhere as coexistent spheres in the general identity of his life. It is the relation of interior and exterior, higher and lower, prior and posterior, cause and effect; and here, as in the case of soul and body, it is the spiritual world of course, which goes before the natural in this order of precedence. Things seen and temporal stand everywhere, thus, in the active presence and power of things unseen and eternal. The spiritual world, it has been well said, works from within, and actuates all and each of the things that exist and are formed in the world of nature, as the human mind works into the senses and motions of the body; so that all the particular things of nature are as it were sheaths and coverings, which encompass spiritual things, and proximately produce effects corresponding to the end of God the Creator.

VI. The spiritual world here introduced to our view, we can see at once, is heaven-wide apart from that abstract and visionary conception of it, by which it is too commonly regarded as being the mere negation or coming to an end of the world of outward sense and matter. We do not characterize it properly, when we speak of it simply as immaterial and supersensible, or resolve it into the notion of an intellectual and ideal system. It is beyond the reach indeed of our present sense, and for this reason it transcends also the range of all our natural thinking.

But this does not make it in any sense shadowy or unreal. In its own superior order of existence, it has a character of positive reality and substance which goes immeasurably beyond the visible and tangible show of things in the world of nature. The spiritual world is not the pale shadow of the natural. On the contrary, it is the cause of the natural, that on which it depends; the interior soul of the natural, that from which it draws its continual life; the universal issue and end of the natural, that in which only all its powers and possibilities become complete. It is a world or universe, full of concrete existence and sensible experience, full of living relations, activities and powers, full of endlessly diversified phenomenal scenery and surroundings, with which, for grandeur, beauty and glory, the universe of nature can bear no comparison whatever.

VII. The living entities, powers and activities of the spiritual world, thus gloriously constituted, refer themselves throughout to God as their origin and source, and in doing so form necessarily an organized system, endlessly manifold and yet universally one, flowing forth with perpetual derivation every where from the fulness of Him, who in such way filleth all in all.

VIII. Collectively considered, this outflowing of the Divine Life, in the presence and power of which the spiritual world is thus created and upheld, is the *Word of God*; the self-utterance of the Infinite and Eternal Father, by which He is to be regarded as coming forth from the otherwise incomprehensible depths of His own absolute being, and making Himself known in the universe of His works. "By the Word of the Lord," we are told, "were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the breath of His mouth." So again: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." What can be more plain or full than this? The whole creation has its principle and beginning here, starting in the spiritual world, and reaching down through that to the natural world, which as we have seen is dependent on the spiritual throughout as a lower and relatively more outward mode of existence. The Word of God is the

alpha and omega of the universe, embracing angels and men, the heavens and all the powers therein, together with the whole boundless compass of nature; all things from first to last, from inmost to outmost, come together in this common ground, and have in them no real cause or power of existence in any other view.

IX. If any thing were needed more than has been already said to establish the idea of an organized harmonious unity, reaching through the universal creation and binding all its parts together as a single whole, we have it with overwhelming force in the great truth here brought into view. The Divine Word is the all in all of creation, the one principle from which the whole of it flows. How then must this not be, through all its orders of existence, through all its economies and constitutions whether of nature or of grace, one always and everywhere with itself, even as the Word is One?

X. The law of original existence for the world in this view, is of course no less necessarily the law also of its continued subsistence. Heaven and earth stand perpetually in the presence and power of the Divine Word; and this not in the character of an almighty *fiat* simply, taking effect upon them in an outwardly mechanical or magical manner, but in the way of life flowing into them continually through the Word from God Himself; in whom as we know, all angels and men, as well as all living creatures lower than man, live, move, and have their being. "Forever, O Lord, Thy Word is settled in heaven; Thou hast established the earth and it abideth." The principle of stability in both cases, is that from which both heaven and earth took their origin in the beginning. So all changes also, through what are called the laws of nature, come no otherwise in truth than by the operation of this Divine agency flowing down into the natural world through the spiritual. Nothing less than this is involved in that magnificent language of the Psalmist: "He sendeth forth His commandment upon earth; His word runneth very swiftly. He giveth snow like wool; He scattereth the hoar-frost like ashes. He casteth forth His ice like morsels; who can stand before His cold? He sendeth

out His Word, and melteth them; He causeth His wind to blow, and the waters flow."

XI. The Divine Word, by which the heavens and the earth continually exist in the way now shown, is the same that constitutes the living soul of all Divine Revelation from the beginning; making the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, in which this Revelation is contained, to be the very embodiment in natural form of a supernatural spiritual power and glory surpassing immeasurably the reach of all merely natural intelligence or thought. This is what we are to understand by the inspiration of the Bible. It is the Word of God, in its ever-living supernal majesty, occupying and possessing the sacred text, not simply as the cause and origin of it at the first, but as its truly informing and actuating spirit through all time. Of the Bible it must be said always in this view, *God is There*. It is the very *shekinah* of His presence, as represented by the Ark containing the two tables of the Law in the Jewish sanctuary; the *testimony*, the *covenant*, so called, in and by which God came near to man and drew man into union with Himself. Everywhere the Bible is this union and meeting together of the invisible and eternal, the "powers of the world to come," with the interior deepest needs and aspirations of the human spirit in its present bodily state. Hence its authority for all orders and degrees of intelligence, from lisping infancy on to old age; an authority not dependent at all on criticism or hermeneutics, but powerful enough if need be to set this at defiance, to turn it into derision, as in itself a higher right, holding consciously—or if not that, then nevertheless *sensibly*—from the felt power of the Divine itself, hidden in the outward text, and yet shining forth from it so as to give understanding to the simple; even as one may take in the light of intelligence from the eye of another, and catch the inspiration of love from his beaming face, whose presence otherwise may be only most imperfectly understood. The full sense of the Holy Scriptures is unfathomable even for the angels themselves. How much less may it be sounded by the plummet of any simply human science? It is a voice everywhere from behind the veil of sense and time,

having in it eternal meaning. What Christ says of His own speech on one occasion is true of Sacred Scripture universally; its words are SPIRIT and LIFE. They are "quick and powerful." God is in them of a truth.

XII. The economy of Revelation ends in what St. Paul calls the "Mystery of Godliness," by which God, as the Word, "for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man." We cannot go too far in owning and proclaiming the infinite majesty of our Lord Jesus Christ, as being in this way the actual manifestation of God in the flesh. The whole truth, and power, and glory of the Gospel, are comprehended in St. Peter's confession, *Thou art the Son of God*. On this rock only, Christianity and the Church stand firm against the powers of hell. The Son of the living God, Christ is Himself the living God; the fulness of the Godhead bodily; the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person; the Lord of heaven and earth; by whom all things were created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; who is before all things, and by whom all things consist. He is the image of the otherwise invisible, unknowable, unapproachable God, whom no man hath seen nor can see. The Father is in Him, as He also is in the Father. He and the Father are one. He is in a word the Jehovah, the *I am*, of the Old Testament; the Alpha and Omega, as He proclaimed Himself in the vision of Patmos, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

XIII. Christ, the Son of God, is the Saviour of the world, through the Divine Life which is in Him as God, and which He is able to communicate derivatively to all who look to Him, and come to Him, for that purpose. Whatever other things enter into the idea of salvation, they are to be regarded as conditional only and incidental to this, which is most plainly set forth in the Gospel as central and fundamental for all else. "In Him was Life," it is said, "and the Life was the light of men." He

is "the way, the truth, the Life." He is "the resurrection and the Life." To follow Him, is to "have the light of Life." He "hath Life in Himself," and in virtue of this "quickeneth whom He will." To His disciples He says, "Because I live, ye shall live also;" making life for them to be the efflux of His own Life. "God hath given to us eternal life"—so the Divine record itself runs—"and this *Life is in His Son*. He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life;" to which St. John adds with grand conclusion: "We know that the Son of God is come; and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son, Jesus Christ. This is the true God and ETERNAL LIFE."

XIV. The Life which is thus in Christ the principle and fountain of salvation for men, must pass over to them in a living way, so as to become in them also a true rational and spiritual life conjoining them with the Life of the Lord; and the organ or faculty by which this is found to be possible on the side of man is *Faith*; which is an activity both of the understanding and the will in their highest form, joining them together as one in the apprehension of the Divine Truth and the Divine Good—these by their everlasting marriage constituting in fact the inmost essence and substance of the Divine Life. Faith is no mechanical or magical appointment in this view, through which men are justified and saved in an outward way by having imputed to them what is in truth no part of their own proper personal existence or experience. It is the meeting of the human spirit inwardly with the enlivening rays that issue actually from the Sun of Righteousness. It is the turning of the soul within itself toward the Lord, and the opening of its inmost receptivity to the life that is forever flowing from His presence.

XV. There is, in such view, only one true faith for man. All the innumerable realities of the spiritual world are so many truths, indeed, which make room for its exercise; but this universe of truths is at the same time one universal complex, in which all refer themselves with inward interdependence, correlation, and common derivation, to the same general origin and

source; and so in full conformity with this, all the possible exercises of genuine faith refer themselves in like manner to a single generality, head themselves together as it were, explicitly or implicitly, in one ground faith which is the root and principle of faith in all other forms. What that primordial faith is—the faith of all faiths—is determined at once by what we are bound to acknowledge as the primordial truth—the truth of all truths—as this comes before us in the being of God, made known to us through His Word, and with full revelation at last only in and by His Son Jesus Christ. The true Christian faith in this view is not made up certainly of a system of separate and independent doctrines or facts, loosely thrown together each on its own supposed evidence and worth; neither can it be made to start from any such particular doctrine or fact at our pleasure. There is but one order here that is either practically or theologically sound and right; and that is the order which is governed by the objective constitution of the Gospel itself, the order which begins with the Lord God our Redeemer and Saviour Jesus Christ, and which sees and owns all other truth only as flowing from His presence.

XVI. It is strange indeed that any one looking earnestly into the New Testament should ever miss seeing, that the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ in the view now stated, the power of owning Him to be the Son of God (with all which that means), not notionally, and from the memory only, but from the interior depths of the soul, is in very truth the beginning of all faith, and that without which all else calling itself faith is turned into a pale abstraction resembling death far more than life. Can Peter's confession, the rock on which the Church is built, ever cease to be what it was in the beginning? Is it less true now than it was eighteen centuries ago, that the one universal work of God, the fountain of all other obedience and righteousness, is to *believe* on Him whom God hath sent? How often are we not told that to believe in Christ as the Son of God is of itself to have eternal life, and that the want of such faith in Him is itself the doom of death, because it is a rejection in fact of the life that dwells in His person and is to be found

nowhere else? "He that heareth my word, He says, and believeth on Him that sent Me (in other words, seeth the Father in the Son), hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." But why go on here with testimonies? On this subject, they are altogether too full for particular quotation.

XVII. Life, eternal life, thus attributed to faith, is not to be viewed as a reward attached to it extrinsically by God, but is the necessary result of what faith is in its own nature and office; as being the medium of communication on the part of man with the Lord of life and glory, who is the fountain of all spiritual being, from which depends, as we have already seen, the right order and perfection also of all natural being. Faith saves us through its object, which is the Divine Truth, being in reality so related to this that neither can be in any man without the other. The Divine Truth (joined always with the Divine Love) is made through faith to be actually in the soul as a part of its own existence, like light in the eye. In Thy light, says the Psalmist, we shall see light. But light again is at once but another term for life; and in the spiritual world, accordingly, the Divine Truth is synonymous with the Divine Life; they cannot be sundered one from the other. In the heavens, truth is substantial essence just as really as life is, both flowing together from the Lord. "I am the Truth," he says; "I am the Light of the world;" "I am the Life;" all in the same intensely realistic sense. Faith, then, as the receptacle of Divine truth, the shining of Divine light in the soul, is necessarily communication at the same time with the Divine Life proceeding from Christ. Its power to save is just this, that it opens the spirit of man, made in the image of God, toward the answerable fulness of God in Christ, and so makes room for a veritable conjunction with Him, in the sense that the very idea of religion has been felt to demand through all ages. This, indeed, is Eternal Life.

XVIII. Christianity, having for its origin and ground our Lord Jesus Christ seen and owned by faith to be the Son of God, in the way now presented, is a vast and mighty system,

as already intimated, of other truths and facts innumerable (taking in at last, indeed, the universal sense of the world), in which, however, all other truths are true, and capable of being truly believed, only in virtue of their inward coherence with what is here the beginning of all Christian life and doctrine. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity, for example, is for our faith and theology, only after Christ, in and through Christ, and not before Him; and can never be construed rightly, except as controlled by the radical confession first of all: *Thou art the Son of God; the I AM, which was, is, and is to come; the Almighty.* So with the Hypostatical Union. So with the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Atonement, the article of Justification, the Church, the Resurrection from the dead. They are all true, in their proper Christian sense, only in and through Christ. They are true Christologically only, and not in any other sense.

XIX. But while the ultimate principle of Christian faith is in this way no other than our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the rule of faith, the medium and measure of its proper exercise, the only sure directory in the end for Christian life and doctrine, is the Divine Revelation contained in the Holy Scriptures. They are "the law and the testimony," by which all truth is to be tried. They are this, however, only through their interior spiritual constitution, only as they are, in the way we have seen, the very presence and power of the same Divine Life by which Christ is declared to be the Light of the world. This it is that constitutes their true internal sense, undiscernible to the natural mind, and makes them to be in truth the "Word of God which liveth and abideth forever." They authenticate and illustrate Christ, only because Christ shines in them everywhere as the Truth of all truth to which they owe their origin. The "spirit of prophecy," we are told, "is the testimony of Jesus;" it flows from Him, and looks toward Him, in every part of the Bible. This reciprocal illumination and witness is no vicious logical circle. It is like the relation between speech and thought, or between body and soul, universally; where each term is intelligible only through the other. The mutual illumi-

nation in the case before us holds in what we have just seen to be the peculiar nature of Faith. It is the inmost and highest in man brought into conjunction with the inflowing life of the Lord; a state thus of direct illumination from Him as the Sun of the spiritual universe, which of itself serves then to show the Scriptures in corresponding illumination also, and so to bring into view their true inward power and glory, whereby "they are able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ." This is that *testimonium spiritus sancti* of which so much account was made in the age of the Reformation, and the true idea of which has been so much obscured since. Not man's spirit as such bearing witness to God's truth (a purely rationalistic conception), but the Spirit of Christ made to be in man actually through his faith. Here lay the sin and condemnation of the Pharisees. They made much of the Scriptures, thinking to have in them eternal life: and yet they had no power to see how the Scriptures testified everywhere to the presence of Christ. Why not? Because they lacked the illumination that comes from inward union with the Divine soul of the Scriptures. "Ye have not God's Word abiding in you," Christ says to them; "for whom He hath sent Him ye believe not." The entrance of God's words giveth light, where they are irradiated with this faith; not otherwise. Entering into man in any other way, the sense of the Bible is adulterated and profaned, and the light of heaven in it is turned into thick darkness.

XX. The view now taken of the relation between Faith and the Revelation of God centering in Christ, carries us beyond the dilemma of false authority and false freedom, from the horns of which it has been found often so difficult to escape in the construction of Christianity. One is the Roman scheme, making the outward Church the beginning and ground and measure of all actual Christian faith and life. The other is the Rationalistic scheme, making the Bible to be all this in the like outward way, as a text book of divine instruction on the plane of the natural understanding, the moral and religious sense of which each man is left to work out as he best can in the exer-

cise of his own free will and private judgment. The two schemes come in the end to substantially the same result. They cast down the Word from its true supernatural throne. They rob the living Christ of His indefeasible majesty, power, and glory. They turn the communion of the spiritual world with the natural into mechanism, magical hocus-pocus, or dim gnostic imagination. They quench the heaven-aspiring light of faith, and will not suffer it to rise into the direct light of the Lord; making reason in this way blind also, and turning it over to perpetual melancholy bondage in the prison-house of the Philistines.

XXI. Christianity, completing as it does the true idea of humanity by bringing it into true union with God, is the completion necessarily at the same time of the entire natural creation which finds in man its highest and last sense; in which view then, as the end of all things going before, it must be regarded as dominating and determining, from first to last, the order both of actual existence and of right intellectual conception, for the world at large. It is not the lower anywhere in the scale of creation, that gives origin and support to the higher. On the contrary the higher as principal and chief ultimates itself everywhere in the lower. So up to the very fountain of all things in Him, who came forth from the Father to be in this way the beginning of the works of God. With this must correspond then any true theory or science of the world. The boasted modern *Weltanschauung* which builds its scheme of the universe on the premises of nature (as though these were for man here the *only* data to start with—the only elements to work with on to the end in trying to understand the problem of his own life), is just as irrational as it is irreligious. The only true *Weltanschauung* is that of the Bible, which derives the harmonious whole of creation, in descending order, from that Uncreated Living Wisdom (the source of all other life and light), which “the Lord possessed in the beginning of His way, before His works of old; which was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was.” The power of seeing and owning this is *Faith*; and just for this reason, faith in

Christ is the eye of intelligence for man, and the light of all science deserving the name. "Through faith," says St. Paul, "we *understand* (intelligize or see with the mind) that the worlds were framed by the word of God;" so that the visible depends everywhere in truth on the invisible, nature on spirit, and not the reverse. Without the felt practical force of this insight into the actual constitution of the world (which only faith can give), science is blind and philosophy insane.

XXII. Where science owns no allegiance to faith in this way, it is Naturalism; and where it pretends to take in the spiritual meaning of the world in the way of religion, it becomes what we are to understand properly by *Humanitarianism*, the great heresy of the present time. This is the idea of a full completion of the world, morally and physically, in man (who is in fact the immediate completion of nature), without the necessary complement of a higher spiritual life descending into him from the Lord. The theory may set itself, as infidelity, in open opposition to the Gospel; or it may affect to take the Gospel to its bosom, and to be just that form of Christianity which is now needed to save Christianity itself from general wreck, amid the rising billows of modern unbelief. It is not to be disguised that such humanitarian Christianity has taken possession widely of the religious thinking of the world at this time; and that the evil is not confined to the doctrinal heterodoxies that have come down to us from other days, but is eating as a cancer also far and wide into what still claims to be the orthodoxy and true evangelical life of the Church. Without going into details it may be said, that wherever the central mystery of Christ is either theoretically or practically cast down from its throne; where He is not seen and owned to be the Son of the Living God, the fountain of all life and light for men in the most real view; and where Faith is not made to be the answer of the soul, first of all, to this primordial Truth, this Truth of all other truths, serving to join man with the inflowing life of the Lord, and becoming thus in man himself a "well of water springing up into everlasting life;" there, we must believe, the right confession of the Gospel is wanting, and the fine gold of the

Christian Sanctuary has become dim. It is Humanitarianism "sitting in the temple of God, and showing itself to be God." There may be an outward cleaving still in the case to old doctrines, regarded as technicals of the faith once *delivered* to the saints; but the doctrines are dead, having no root in the Living Christ (mere *εἰδωλα*, simulacra, pallid corpse-like abstractions, 1 John v. 21); and so are ready always to go up like the crackling of thorns before the fire of skeptical criticism. Or it may be, the whole idea of doctrine and mystery has been given up, under the plausible notion that all true religion has to do at last only with a good life, and what we may call the spiritual culture of man from the plane of his simply human life as such. As if the second table of the Law hung not forever from the first table! As if there could be any true morality for man without true religion! As if the life of humanity might be imagined capable of completion in any way, without being apprehended, and raised as it were above itself, by the eternal life which God hath given to us in His Son! Under either view, that of dead doctrine or that of no doctrine, the mystery of error here described comes to the same thing. Antichrist, it is in both forms, working and warring against the only true idea of Christ.

XXIII. That this true idea of Christ is indeed the question of all questions for the age, and the question toward the right solution of which all the inmost powers and deepest needs of the age are, with growing urgency, now pressing from all sides, is coming to be more and more plain to the observation of the thoughtful every day. Science, politics, and morals, believingly or unbelievingly, are forced to do homage to it. No theology has living interest, no confessionalism is more than a grinning skeleton of dry bones, apart from it. All the issues of faith and infidelity, spiritual life and spiritual death, are heading themselves together here, in the grand heaven-and-earth moving interrogation of our Lord Himself: "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?" Who is He as related to God? Who is He, and what is He as related to humanity and the world?

XXIV. The right knowledge and acknowledgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the view we have now taken of what He is as the full and only visible Manifestation of the otherwise invisible God, the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and that which necessarily goes along with this, the right idea, namely, of what true saving faith is on the side of man, as first of all a direct looking to and coming to the Lord beheld in such Divine Majesty, whereby room is offered for the inflowing of truth, righteousness and life, in the most real way, from His presence; these two in union—are they not, beyond all else, what the critical questionings and confusions of this last time of the Church are plainly forcing into view more and more from all sides, as the only true answer to the great world-problem with which they are concerned? Here, and here only it would seem, have we any solid ground on which to stand, in the conflict between faith and science, revelation and reason, the real existence of a personal God, on the one hand, and Naturalism, or Nature made to stand for God, on the other hand. Here, and here only, is the way opened for a real coming together of Christianity and Humanity, Religion and Morality, in the historical life of the world. Here in its only true beginning, must theology find also its true end. Here only can the strife of doctrines, the *odium theologicum* of religious systems and schools, be made to cease. Here only if ever, can the war of sects and confessions so much as *begin* even to look toward the unity and catholicity of a genuine church life. One Lord Jesus Christ the Son of the Living God, to begin with; and so one faith, one worship, one life. To talk of negotiating or bringing to pass Christian orthodoxy or catholicity in any way other than this, is but hypocrisy and sham. As He is our Life, so He alone is our Light also and our Peace.

ART. II.—SCRIPTURE VIEW OF DIVINE WORSHIP.

BY REV. D. Y. HEISLER, A. M., MT. ALTO, PA.

THE subject of Divine worship, whether viewed in its own nature, or in its relation to the spiritual welfare and edification of God's people, must be regarded as a matter of the highest importance. Whatever, therefore, in any way serves to throw light on this subject, or contributes, in the least, to the solution of this interesting problem, is worthy of attention. We propose, accordingly, in this paper to discuss the general subject of Divine worship, mainly, however, in a Scriptural point of view; and in doing so, we, shall carefully question the Sacred Writings, and elicit from them, as the highest authority, whatever light they may afford on this interesting question.

We take for granted, what, we believe, is generally assumed, that neither in the earlier pages of Holy Writ, nor in the writings of the New Testament, is there any formal instruction given on this subject, nor any definite and fixed order of worship prescribed, nor even any general principles proposed upon which an order of worship or offices of devotion are to be constructed. Whatever is found relating to this subject, except in connection with the legal or Mosaic economy, comes before us simply in the way of actual history or incidental reference; and only by a careful examination of these incidental allusions and historical notices, do we propose to construct some kind of a scheme of worship, and to offer some plausible suggestions on the subject of common prayer or public devotions.

In accordance with our general assumption, then, we remark that the earlier portions of Holy Writ, dealing, as they do, with primitive times and primitive customs, and being distinguished by great simplicity, throw but little light on the subject in hand. The patriarchal period furnishes, so far as our

knowledge extends, only a few cursory and indistinct hints in reference to the mode of worshiping the Supreme Being; and these few notices, even, have reference mainly, if not exclusively, to private worship—to the devotions of pious and God-fearing persons in their individual capacity. In those early times of childlike simplicity, each one held communion with God directly for himself, or, at most, each in connection with the members of his own family; and, hence, the nature and form of their devotions differ widely from those of the saints in subsequent periods of the Church. The only probable notice we have of public worship, in this primitive period, is found in connection with the mention of Enos, the son of Seth, where it is said: "Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord." It is doubtful, however, whether this memorable passage asserts the inauguration of public and associated worship, or simply states the fact that then a more decided separation took place between those who had hitherto called themselves "the Sons of men," and those who now, first, began to be called "the Sons of God," worshipers of Jehovah, or, "by the name of the Lord," as some would render the passage.

Leaving, therefore, this early period of the Church, as furnishing no satisfactory data in reference to public worship, we pass on to notice the peculiar rites and ceremonies, which were instituted in the time of Moses, and their relation to the devotions of God's people in subsequent times.

That a certain definite form of religious service or public worship was divinely instituted in connection with the Mosaic System, no one can for a moment question. So particular was the Almighty in reference to this point, that the entire inner and outward arrangement of the Tabernacle, and afterwards of the Temple, was of divine origin—in exact accordance with the "pattern" shown to the Jewish Lawgiver, in the holy mount. This peculiar arrangement had distinct reference to the several forms and essential elements of that worship which entered into the established or ordinary devotions of the Sanctuary. Hence we find here a permanently arranged and splendid ritual—with prescribed forms for the celebration of Divine worship, closing

probably in all ordinary cases, with the Aaronic benediction. (Num. vi. 23-27). These arrangements, it is true, had reference mainly to the prescribed sacrifices or sacred offerings, and were, as a matter of course, only temporary and typical—looking forward to the offering of the one only true and perennial sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. Hence they were in due time to be done away wholly as to form, while the substance only was to remain. Everything, distinctively Legal or Levitical in connection with that extraordinary system, looked forward constantly to a better time coming, as being itself imperfect and preliminary only—of which coming time, however, it was the shadow or image, while the true substance—that of which these prophetic images were the types and shadows—was to come in at the appearance of the great Deliverer. Types necessarily imply anti-types—fulfilments—answering in their essential elements, and in a higher and better form, to these types and shadows, or prophetic images.

The worship of the Sanctuary, as originally instituted by Moses, and in time possibly somewhat deteriorated, was greatly improved under the successive administrations of David and Solomon; the former of whom, especially, earnestly labored to improve the services of God's house, by appointing a special order of men—the Levites—whose chief duty it was to conduct the devotions of God's people, and to render the services of the Sanctuary more solemn and impressive. For this purpose the use of sacred music, both instrumental and vocal, was extensively introduced and assiduously cultivated—singers and players on instruments having been chosen and organized into regular choirs or courses. This work of liturgical reform and improvement was undertaken, as we are expressly informed, by special divine inspiration; and, hence, bears the seal of the Divine approbation (1 Chron. xxviii. 11-20). Now what is peculiarly striking about these divinely ordained services, or forms of worship, is, that they are found to be largely responsive. Any amount of evidence can be adduced to establish this point. These fixed forms of devotion had reference to ordinary occasions—to the customary worship of the Sanctuary—as well as to special

and extraordinary times and seasons. The beautiful and affecting rites observed in connection with the introduction of the Ark of the Covenant into the Tabernacle, under David (1 Chron. xvi. 1-36), and the still more magnificent service connected with the dedication of the Temple, under Solomon, (1 Kings viii. and 2 Chron. v.-vii.), are sufficient to show the general character of these ancient and imposing services.* These sublime forms of worship, employed on *special* occasions, as well as many others used in connection with the regular and stated services of the Sanctuary, and others privately, are all carefully preserved to us in the oracles of divine truth. A large number of such prayers, used on a great diversity of occasions, and in all possible connections, are found recorded word for word; all of which shows that these prayers were either precomposed for these several special or ordinary occasions, or that they were subsequently written out by inspired men, and thus preserved for the use of future generations. In either case they bear the seal of the Divine approbation, and furnish strong and conclusive evidence—Scriptural evidence—in favor of pre-arranged services and the lawfulness of established forms of Divine worship.

The special point we wish to make, is, that not only for *special* occasions were pre-arranged forms of worship employed, but that for the ordinary services of the Sanctuary, also, during the Mosaic or Old Testament dispensation, certain definite offices of devotion—of an intensely responsive character—were, by Divine ordination, prepared and used in the services of the Tabernacle and the Temple. This circumstance alone, as we have already remarked, is amply sufficient to show their lawfulness; and what was once lawful and right, in connection with a divinely established system of worship, can never essentially and as to substance, be absolutely wrong. In confirmation of this remark, and as a further evidence of the general prevalence of such fixed forms of worship and their lawfulness,

* See also 1 Chron. xxiii. 24-32; xxix. 10-20; 2 Chron. xxix. 25-36; Ezra iii. 10-13, and Neh. xii. 24.

we may in addition to the instances already given, refer to the recorded prayers of Hezekiah (Isa. xxxviii. 9-20); of Ezra (Ezra ix. 5-20); of Nehemiah (Neh. i. 4-10); of Isaiah (Isa. lxiv. 1-12); of Jeremiah (Lam. v. 1-22); of Daniel (Dan. ix. 3-19); of Habakkuk (Hab. iii. 1-19) and many others which might be cited; also that beautiful prayer of David (1 Chron. xvii. 26-27). In fact the entire Book of Psalms is nothing else than a manual of devotions, and was anciently so used in the way of private and public worship. It constituted an essential part of the established Liturgy of the Jewish Church—the book of sacred song, and of devout prayer and praise!

Many of these sublime compositions were regularly used in connection with the worship of God—some in the ordinary temple services, and others in connection with festival occasions, and other special and extraordinary services.* Quite a number of these Psalms are, in their structure and spirit, distinctly responsive, and were evidently used in this way by the Israelites,—being sung or chanted, either by the people and the priests or Levites, or by these latter alone, antiphonally.†

When, in the time of Ezra, the Synagogue was, through the instrumentality of this eminent servant of God, originated, the circumstances called for a new and somewhat modified ritual or order of worship. The devotional part of the Synagogue service, as provided by Ezra, was in fixed forms, and withal largely responsive. The most solemn part of the service consisted of the “Shemoneh Esreh,” or “eighteen prayers,” as they were called. The main petitions, in this collection of public prayers, were offered by the officiating minister, and the responses made by the assembled worshipers, in the form of a confirmatory benediction, answering in substance and general tone to the body of the prayer, or the several petitions. These eighteen prayers, however, constituted but a small part of the regular

* So, in connection with the Paschal feast, were used the following Psalms cxiii. -cxviii. inclusive. For other instances see Nevin's Bib. Antiq. Vol. II. pp. 165-182.

† Of this responsive character are the twenty-fourth and one hundred and thirty-sixth Psalms especially. See also Psa. xli. lxxii. lxxxix. cvl.; and Deut. xxvii. 14-26.

worship, and came in very much in the same way as do the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed in our Christian Worship. They formed the heart and core of the service.*

Now what we wish to say in reference to this point, is, that our Saviour and His Apostles stately worshiped, whether in the Synagogue or in the Temple, in these ancient and established forms, and so gave them their solemn sanction. Among all the scathing rebukes and solemn admonitions, which the Saviour administered to the Jewish people, and, especially to their proud and self-righteous leaders—the Scribes and Pharisees—we find not a single word of complaint or disapproval in reference to these ordinary forms of worship. He never charged them with “ritualism,” nor warned them against the danger of using such fixed and established forms in their daily or weekly devotions. He regularly attended the worship of the Temple and also of the Synagogue, and took an active part in the services which belonged to them respectively (Luke ii. 22-52, and iv. 16-21). So with the Apostles; they were regular in their attendance upon the Jewish worship, not only during the Saviour's personal ministry, but also subsequent to His death and resurrection, and freely participated in the prayers and ordinary services of the sanctuary (Acts ii. 1-4, and 41-47; iii. 1-11; and v. 12-16). In all their diversified missionary labors, also, the Apostles uniformly visited the Jewish Synagogues and there worshiped God along with their “brethren according to the flesh,” and, as a matter of course, in the fixed and ordinary forms of devotion. So far as appears from the sacred record, they did not regard these forms as in any way wrong, nor were their higher and more enlightened Christian feelings shocked and repressed. Apparently, at least, they worshiped in these established forms, freely and without any sense of impropriety, the God of their fathers; and it is reasonable to suppose, that, in the gradual rise of a more distinctively Christian worship, it

* For an account of these “eighteen prayers” or “*SHEMONEH ESREH*,” as they are called, please consult Prideaux's “*Connexion*,” Pars I. lib. vi. See also Horne's “*Introduction*,” Vol. II. pp. 104-107; and Eisenmenger—“*Entdecktes Judenthum*,” for an account of the forms of worship current among the Jews.

would naturally be cast in the general mould of the ancient ritual, in so far as these forms themselves were not inconsistent with the higher spirit of the new and perfected religion.

Now, in looking at the different forms of worship in connection with the Temple and the Synagogue, respectively, we find those of the former more exclusively confined to the sacerdotal order—consisting mainly in the responsive chanting or singing of certain Psalms by the Priests and Levites, or by these latter alone, while the people either united in these sacred songs, or, possibly, were engaged in silent prayer. The worship of the Synagogue was of a more popular and general character—the people taking a far more active part in these services. Hence the frequent and earnest disputes as to which of these modes of worship, that of the Temple or that of the Synagogue, was chiefly adopted by the early Christians. Roman Catholic writers, we believe, generally persist on giving the preference to the Temple service, as the model for the Early Church, while Protestant writers have insisted with equal uniformity and zeal on the Synagogue service, as the pattern, according to which the worship of the Apostolic and primitive Church was mainly fashioned. The somewhat separate and isolated position which the sacerdotal order occupied in the Temple service would naturally induce Roman Catholic writers to give it the preference, as it seems most naturally to fall in with their own flashy and more imposing ritual. Protestants as naturally prefer the Synagogue worship as normative for the Apostolic and primitive Church, and the ordering of its services. But singularly enough, while this Synagogue worship is intensely responsive, and thus makes full room for the practical application of our favorite doctrine of a universal priesthood and the rights of the people, our modern Churches almost invariably repudiate the responsive element in worship, and confine the active participation of the people almost wholly to the singing, or possibly to singing and the repetition of the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed, while the remainder of the worship is confined exclusively to the ministry. This evidently is a gross and unaccountable inconsistency on the part of our modern Churches.

It is practically to surrender the doctrine of the universal priesthood of all Christians in favor of the opposite view, and that, too, on a point where its firm and steady assertion would be of the most vital importance.

But we do not wish to press this point any further now than to express our conviction that this doctrine is not only true, but also highly important in a practical point of view, and should not be tamely surrendered to our spiritual antagonists.

Leaving for the present the Old Testament times, and the several forms of worship in vogue during that ancient and preparatory dispensation, we now pass on to notice some things in connection with the New Testament times, which appear to us highly relevant to this subject. The dawning of the new era brought with it new relations and higher agencies and instrumentalities. John the Baptist came in as a special messenger—as the connecting link between the old and new dispensations, and his position is therefore peculiar. The few notices we have of him are interesting and instructive. He not only continued in the use of the ancient forms of worship, but, as the new order of things required some new forms of devotion more fully and distinctly expressive of the higher sentiments which distinguished this eminent servant of God, he also, among other things, taught his disciples new and additional forms of devotion (Luke xi. 1). What exactly these new features in the worship of John and his disciples were, we cannot tell; but they probably involved some reference to the glorious things which were ready to be revealed—faintly dawning upon the vision of the Baptist himself and of the more advanced of his followers. The disciples of our blessed Lord also felt the need of some appropriate forms of devotion, such as would express more fully the new and higher promptings of their own hearts. Hence they came to our Saviour for like instructions in prayer, suggested probably by his own devotions, and the peculiar force and spirit which distinguished them. “And it came to pass, that, as He was praying in a certain place, when He ceased, one of His disciples said unto Him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.” And in compliance with their

request, "He said unto them, when ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven," etc. (Luke xi. 1-5; comp. Matt. vi. 9-13). The conduct of John, and, above all, the conduct of our Adorable Redeemer clearly teaches two things; first, that it is right and proper to use fixed forms of prayer; and, secondly, that such forms may be legitimately and appropriately used in concert, or publicly; for this model Prayer, be it distinctly observed, is designed for associated or united worship, and is clearly distinguished from private prayer, which is mentioned in the same connection, but in wholly different terms. These private devotions are to be attended to in secret, while the particular form of the prayer, or prayers, is left entirely to the discretion of each individual worshiper (Matt. vi. 4-13).

Bearing in mind these facts, which are indisputable, and seeing that Jesus and His apostles regularly worshiped both in the Synagogue and in the Temple, and thus sanctioned by their own example the use of these fixed and responsive forms, we are warranted to conclude with almost absolute certainty, that, in so far as the principle of using established forms of worship is concerned, we are perfectly safe, and that such forms are not in any way antagonistic to the religion of Christ. But the inference becomes far stronger when we bear in mind that all these ancient forms, whether belonging to the Temple or Synagogue service, were strictly preparatory to the New Testament times, and New Testament forms of worship. This view of the case is abundantly confirmed by the subsequent history of the Church—both during the Apostolic and post-Apostolic periods. Incidental references and hints to this effect, as well as more distinct and conclusive evidence, are found scattered throughout the New Testament Scriptures. The frequent occurrence of the expression "with one accord"—*ὁμοθυμαδόν*—as applied to prayer and the worship of the disciples generally furnishes strong confirmatory evidence of the position assumed.* That in the Christian assemblies some responses were used is clear from 1 Cor. xiv. 14-17; where the Apostle refers

* As instances of the use of this expression, see Acts i. 14; ii. 1, 46; iv. 24; v. 12; Rom. xv. 6.

in an informal way to the fact that the worshiper is expected to speak the "AMEN" at the giving of thanks. Such an allusion would be utterly inexplicable and meaningless except on the supposition that these responses were customary, and hence perfectly familiar to the brethren to whom the Epistle is addressed. This is precisely what we might have expected from persons, who were reared and spiritually trained in the united and responsive services of the Jewish Sanctuary, and from amidst these hallowed scenes of the Synagogue and Temple worship passed over into the higher and holier sphere of the Christian life and Christian worship. The venerable services, in which they had been trained, were indeed typical only and temporary, and hence destined to pass away in due time, especially those having more particular reference to the offerings in the Temple; but the very nature of a type is such as to require an anti-type, answering in full to the type in substance, at least; so that, while the outward form is changed and left behind, the true inward life and substance remain. The conclusion, therefore, forces itself irresistibly upon us, that, in the New Testament dispensation, which was but the consummation of the Old or legal economy, the worship of the Saints must correspond substantially with that of the ancient and typical system. If it were otherwise the whole aim and object of that system, as disciplinary and preparatory to the New Testament times, would have failed of being accomplished. In this sense, namely, in the sense of the substantial continuance and perpetuation of the Old economy in the New, we must understand that remarkable saying of our Lord: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." While, therefore, the Saviour came to "make all things new," He also distinctly teaches that this renewing of all things consists not in a process of destruction or annihilation, but of consummation rather; just as the child passes into the youth, and the youth into the full-grown man, each successive step in the process leaving behind what is

merely accidental and thus suited only to the lower plane; while the inner life and substance are necessarily carried forward, and embodied in somewhat modified forms in the higher and more perfect state. It is so in all departments of life. In the mineral kingdom, even, this process of elevation and gradual perfection takes place under the operations of the law of crystallization. Much more clearly is this process of growth from the lower to the higher and more perfect state seen in the vegetable and animal kingdoms under the silent workings of what is called the plastic power. The same thing holds true in regard to the intellectual and moral world, and also as regards the domain of spirit. Of this last, according to the teachings of our great High-priest, the world of nature is the significant image and prophecy. "So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself; first the blade; then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."

That such a process—a *two-fold* process—of elimination of what was strictly temporary and transient in the ancient system, and of the gradual assimilation of what was truly divine and permanent, in reference to the worship of that system, took place in connection with the rise of the Christian Church and of the more distinctively Christian worship, we think, is perfectly clear from what has been already said, and is fully confirmed by the history of the later or post-Apostolic Church. The New Testament itself furnishes abundant evidence, direct and indirect, that the Apostles and other disciples, following the example of their Lord, continued to worship in the Temple and Synagogue, even after His ascension to heaven and the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. Besides being together "with one accord in one place," waiting for the fulfilment of Christ's promise, which took place "when the day of Pentecost was fully come," they also afterwards "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers," literally in *the* prayers—the established forms of

worship. Thus "continuing daily with one accord in the temple," while "breaking bread from house to house," they showed proper regard for the old, while the new and distinctively Christian elements of worship were not neglected. So afterwards, and in like spirit, "Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour,"—the time for the stated morning service. Looking at these facts, we are warranted to draw this conclusion, namely, that, in the gradual formation of the Christian ritual or the adoption of suitable forms of worship, whether written or unwritten, the apostles naturally embodied in these forms of devotion many of the better elements of the Jewish worship to which from childhood they had been accustomed, and in the power and spirit of which their spiritual life and character had been formed. Such a conclusion, in the absence of opposing evidence, is forced upon us with absolute and irresistible power; and all subsequent history bears us out in this conclusion. But before passing on to demonstrate historically the gradual rise of such a Christian ritual or system of worship, we wish to call attention to a still more remarkable fact in connection with the New Testament Scriptures and its relation to Christian worship. We refer to the several scenes in the worship of heaven, as brought to our notice in the vision of St. John.

When in the Isle of Patmos "for the Word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ," the beloved disciple was favored with a most remarkable and singularly instructive vision of heaven—of its blessed inhabitants and the nature of their worship. The scenes which passed before the vision of the holy Seer, as he gazed into the open heavens, were grand and imposing in the highest degree, and in striking contrast with the tame and frigid system of worship contended for by the champions of modern orthodoxy. We find these several scenes brought together and carefully classified by the late Dr. Harbaugh, in his *Work on the Future State*.* In some introductory remarks the sainted author very beautifully says: "Our

* Vol. III. pp. 308-326.

faithful Saviour has not forgotten to draw for us some pictures of heavenly worship, which 'He sent and signified by His angel unto His servant John;' who bare record of the Word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. In his vision there is a sublime mingling of earth and heaven—the groans, trials, and longings of 'the Church that waiteth for Him,' and the victorious shouts and thankful songs of 'the Church which is around Him.'—From him who had such visions of the upper sanctuary, we may certainly learn something of the services which make up the heavenly worship."

As a specimen of these celestial scenes, on which it behooves us earnestly to meditate, we here insert what may be called the first vision; and not to incur the charge of marring this beautiful picture of the heavenly worship, we shall give it entire, and in the very words of St. John himself—thus:

"After this I looked, and, behold, a door was opened in heaven: and the first voice which I heard was as it were of a trumpet talking with me; which said "*Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter.*" And immediately I was in the Spirit! and, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne. And He that sat on the throne was to look upon like a jasper and sardine stone: and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald. And round about the throne were four and twenty seats; and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold. And out of the throne proceeded lightnings, and thunders, and voices: and there were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne which are the seven Spirits of God. And before the throne there was a sea of glass, like unto crystal; and in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts full of eyes before and behind. And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within:

and they rest not day and night, saying—*‘Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.’*

“And when those beasts give glory, and honor, and thanks, to Him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before Him that sat on the throne, and worship Him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, *‘Thou art worthy O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power: for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created.’*

“And I saw in the right hand of Him that sat on the throne a book, written within and on the back-side, sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, *‘Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof?’*

“And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon. And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the elders saith unto me, *‘Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.’*

“And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of Him that sat upon the throne. And when He had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sang a new song, saying, *‘Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth.’*

“And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders, and the num-

ber of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, '*Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.*'

"And every creature which was in heaven, and on the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, '*Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever.*'"

"And the four beasts said, '*AMEN.*' And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshiped Him that liveth for ever and ever.

"And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seals; and I heard as it were the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts saying, '*Come and see.*'"—And so at the opening of the second seal, and of the third, and of the fourth, the several beasts, or living ones, successively said, "*Come and see.*" And at the opening of the fifth seal, John "saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, '*How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?*' And white robes were given to every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled."

Quite a number of such scenes might be adduced from this book of wonders, showing the intensely responsive character of the heavenly worship: but this one must suffice.* In like scenes we, too, shall hereafter take part; and the worship in the sanctuary on earth is preliminary to that of heaven, and designed to prepare us for that higher and purer worship in which the redeemed from among men, and the countless hosts of heaven are represented as taking part. And can any sane man, now, imagine that our worship on earth, instituted for the

* See also Rev. vii. 9-17; viii. 1-5; xi. 15-18; xvi. 4-7; xix. 1-7.

express purpose of fitting us for heaven and its blessed worship, must be wholly different in form from that of heaven, and thus be rendered virtually a useless service, so far as preparation for heaven is concerned? Such a supposition is perfectly monstrous, and must refute itself in the view of all reasonable and thoughtful men. No presumption is more unlikely than this, or less entitled to regard. It is indeed hard to conceive how any man, with ordinary intelligence and piety, can be so foolhardy as to deny the propriety of an orderly and responsive form of worship, such as employs the blessed angels, and the redeemed from among men, in heaven!

Whether or not a better way of serving God is at hand, and whether this or the other system of worship is to be adopted, or whether both systems are to be combined, that is quite another question, a matter of mere taste or opinion, in reference to which every man has a perfect right to exercise his own judgment, and decide accordingly. All we contend for, is, the Scripture warrant for an established and responsive order of worship,—its propriety and lawfulness. For the establishment of this point, evidence, varied, full, and abundant, is furnished by the whole history of God's ancient and covenant people—by the special divine appointment and long-continued use of a system of worship, which, especially in its later and more popular form in connection with the Synagogue, was well defined and settled—by the example of Christ and His apostles—by the many incidental notices and casual references found scattered throughout the New Testament Scriptures—by the express mention of the responsive "AMEN," and, finally, by the intensely responsive character of the heavenly worship, as brought to our notice in the Revelation of St. John; which heavenly worship is that, as we have already shown, in which we also are finally to take part, and for which we are to be qualified by our united worship in the Church on earth.

So far, then, as the Scriptures say anything at all of Divine worship, either directly or indirectly, they are clearly in favor of some fixed and definite forms of worship, and against the bald spiritualism which characterizes the modern anti-liturgical

school. We do not say that such a system of worship is absolutely required. This would be foolish in the highest degree. Not everything, that is Scriptural and right at any one particular time, is always and under all possible circumstances Scripturally right and necessary. All that we contend for in this connection, is, that fixed and responsive forms of worship are sanctioned in the Scriptures, and that they constituted the prevailing order of worship for the saints of old, during a period of time and under outward relations distinctly preparatory to the Christian dispensation, and that, therefore, under substantially similar circumstances, the same kind of worship would be perfectly legitimate and proper for God's people at any subsequent period in the history of the Church.

Admitting the typical, prophetic, and preparatory nature of the Old Testament dispensation, and yet denying the substantial continuance of what was essential in that system, in the later dispensation, would be virtually to declare the whole system a failure; or it would be, to use a familiar illustration, like putting a child to an apprenticeship, in order to fit himself for some mechanical calling or occupation, and have his training during the continuance of his apprenticeship, so arranged as to compel him, at its close, to repudiate the whole term of his service and all the skill and experience which he had acquired in the use of implements, in *spite* of the object for which he served his apprenticeship, or, rather, exactly because of his apprenticeship, which, according to our supposition, was only *typical* and preparatory, and hence temporary. But does not the very nature of a typical and preparatory dispensation require us to assume that every thing belonging to such a system has distinct and constant reference to that by which it is to be succeeded, and for the coming of which it is to prepare the way? And these same remarks apply equally to the probationary state on earth, and its relation to the consummated state of the saints in heaven. Hence, what we assumed in regard to the Mosaic system, namely, that it was expressly arranged with a view of preparing the saints of old for the coming in of the New Testament dispensation, and for its higher and purer worship,

that we must also assume in reference to their probationary state on earth, namely, that in the providence of God, it was to be so arranged as evidently to prepare us for the consummated state of the saints in glory. And this precisely is the object we have in view in asserting a substantial likeness between Christian worship and the divinely ordained worship of God's ancient people, which, in the deepest sense of the term, was a service "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things."

The lawfulness, or scriptural character of a responsive worship, is, we think, abundantly established. We now, accordingly, proceed to confirm and illustrate this view of the case by an appeal to the subsequent or post-Apostolic history of the Church. And here we notice first and foremost the uniform testimony of the early or primitive Liturgies. These interesting productions vary considerably in form, but are remarkably similar as to their substantial life and general spirit. This peculiarity proves two things; first, that these ancient Liturgies were not in any way copies one from the other, but sprang, either from the prevailing Christian consciousness of the times, or from Apostolic customs and traditions; and, secondly, that, originating thus in a common Christian feeling, they bear legitimate testimony, singly and collectively, to the deep-felt want and independent composition of these early forms of Liturgical worship.

The testimony of these early Liturgies, especially in reference to that central act of Divine worship—the Holy Communion—is of a most general and important character, coming to us almost simultaneously, and with singular unanimity, from all parts of the primitive Christian world. The early period in which these Liturgical forms are met with, as well as the remarkable resemblance they bear to each other, while in some respects they greatly differ, and also their independent origin and use in countries so widely separated from each other, are all note-worthy and give additional force to the argument in favor of their Apostolic origin, substantially, at least, and as to the essential elements which enter into their composition.

The Rev. M. F. Sadler, to whom we are largely indebted for our knowledge of these primitive Liturgies, after some general remarks on the subject, says very pertinently: "The use of these documents reaches back to a time when there was no central ecclesiastical authority recognized all over Christendom—such as the Pope—to recommend to distant Churches the adoption of any form used by his own Church, and when there was no union of Church and State to compel obedience to any ritual. These Liturgies, while in some respects differing from one another widely, all agree in certain remarkable features. They all contain particular forms of words, which are in substance the same; and the most noticeable of these are forms which the people either use wholly, or in which they take their part along with the celebrant by response."*

The number of these early forms of devotion is very great, and they were in use, as we have seen, in all parts of the world. We have, for instance, the Liturgy of St. James, used in Jerusalem and other parts of Palestine,—that of St. Mark, current in Egypt and adjacent countries—that of the Apostles, as it is called—that of St. John Chrysostom—that of St. Basil—the Coptic of St. Basil also—that of Theodore the Interpreter—the Clementine—the Ethiopic—the Armenian—those of Mesopotamia and Malabar—the Mosarabic, said to have been used in Spain from the earliest times, and representing the ancient Liturgies of Spain and Gaul—the Gallican and the Celtic.

After giving copious extracts from these various Liturgies, and carefully comparing with each other the different forms of expression used, Mr. Sadler concludes thus: "Let us now sum up how matters stand respecting these primitive Liturgies. We have cited them, not merely as testifying to the use of forms, but to the use of certain forms which enable the people to join audibly in the most sacred parts of the service. The New Testament writers have left no directions whatever respecting public prayers. The only thing which we learn from the New Testament, is, that the leading act of Christian assemblies was

* "CHURCH DOCTRINE—BIBLE TRUTH," pp. 259-281; where the subject of these Primitive Liturgies is fully discussed.

the 'breaking of bread.'—Well, we have certain (very ancient and widely diffused) documents, called *Liturgies*—the very word 'Liturgy' signifying a service belonging to the people—all Communion offices—all traceable to the remotest antiquity, in lands as far apart as Malabar and Spain, Gaul and Ethiopia, Armenia and Milan.

"These Liturgies contain forms of prayer and praise which are alike both in the words used, and in the fact that particular opportunity is given for the whole congregation to take part in them.

"Who ordered the use of these forms? The most ancient are ascribed to Apostles, or Apostolic men. Of this we may be certain, that no name in the Universal Church of Christ, from the times of the Apostles, has had sufficient weight to induce all Christendom, from Spain to Malabar, to begin their Communion Services with certain words to which the people all the world over give the same response, and, besides this, to cause them universally to adopt as their own the Hymn of the Seraphim, and also to recite the words of our Lord when He instituted the Eucharist, and also to ordain that every Liturgy (except the Roman) should have a specific direction in this place to the people to respond, and also that all should recite the Lord's Prayer, but not without a preparatory prayer for boldness, or, in other words, for the Spirit of adoption, to say, 'Abba, Father.'

"And these Liturgies agree yet further than this; for in seven or eight other matters do they all correspond with one another, as has been shown in such a well-known book as Palmer's '*Origines Liturgicæ*.'

"Now, since the Apostles passed to their rest, what Saint, or Patriarch, or Pope, or Emperor, has had the power so to revolutionize the worship of all Christendom, as to induce Churches at opposite ends of the earth to substitute for a fancied primitive worship, in which all was left to the will of the one man who conducted the service, a totally different worship, which, with every variety of detail in particular Liturgies, still rigidly adheres to certain forms, and was characterized by cer-

tain very strongly marked features; these forms being such as enabled the people to take their part in the most solemn acts of Divine Service, and the features the very opposite of those which characterize Ultra-Protestant worship?"

Thus far Mr. Sadler. His statements are full and candid, and his reasonings fair and conclusive. It appears to us that it would be a difficult task to undertake either to refute his arguments, or to do away with his statements. The copious extracts which he furnishes from these venerable documents, the striking comparisons which he makes between similar parts taken from these different Liturgies, and the luminous exhibition which he thus gives of the whole collection, all conspire to bring conviction to the mind of the reader. The very existence of these remarkable documents, in the early ages of the Church, furnishes strong presumptive evidence in favor of the ground we assumed, in our brief review of the Scriptural testimonies, in support of responsive forms of worship, having been, if not formally established, at least, impliedly sanctioned. It is hard to conceive how such a number of Liturgical forms, originated and used in different and widely separated countries, showing by their variations an independent origin, and, yet, by their striking resemblances, testifying to a common parentage, could possibly have come into being except on the supposition, that, in principle, at least, they are found in Holy Scripture, and sanctioned by the example of our Lord and His Apostles. The frequent recurrence of the responsive "AMEN," and the "HALLELUJAH," and other Scriptural forms of speech, seem evidently to point back to the sacred writings, and especially to the Psalms—the book of devotions for the Church on earth in all ages, and to the Revelation of St. John—the repository of some instances of the devotions of the saints on high, who worship the same God in that temple "not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."*

The testimony of these early Liturgies, in the view of some,

* See especially also; Num. v. 22; Deut. xxvii. 14-26; 1 Chron. xvi. 36; Psa. cvi. 48; Rev. xix. 1-4; and xxii. 20.

might possibly appear suspicious because they are brought to our notice in the work of an English Churchman. But when the documents themselves are furnished for inspection, it matters not who brings them before us. Our judgment, in such a case, is based not on the ecclesiastical connection and sentiments of the author, but on the nature of the documents themselves. But any amount of corroborative evidence is furnished by other sources wholly beyond suspicion on this account. Even such a man as Coleman, though thoroughly Puritanic in his views, and evidently anxious to break the force of the evidence which history bears to the prevalence of Liturgical forms of worship in the primitive period, is constantly testifying to the positions here assumed. In speaking of the worship of the early Christians and its freedom from ostentation, he says: "Their prayers were accordingly offered in the greatest simplicity, and as far as possible in the phraseology of Scripture. This artlessness and elegant simplicity appears in striking contrast with the ostentation and bombast of a later date. This contrast appears equally great also in the *brevity* of these prayers. It was a maxim in the primitive Church, that many words should never be employed to express what might be said in a few. So manifest was this excellence, that Basil, Chrysostom, and Gregory the Great, successively attempted to abridge the formularies of the Church, and restore their early simplicity and brevity.—Every Church, whether national or individual, prescribed its own mode of worship. In many instances the prayers of the Church were merely submitted to the examination and approbation of the Bishop. Beyond all question, the use of a Liturgy and Ritual was at first wholly voluntary. This subject is discussed at length by Bingham, who maintains that a Liturgy and set forms of prayer were used from the beginning, but admits that each Church was at liberty to form its own Liturgy, and that the prayers were probably uttered *memoriter*, and continued for one or two centuries by *tradition*, before they were committed to writing."*

* "Antiquities of the Chris. Church," pp. 210, 211.

These extracts fully admit the existence of primitive Liturgies or fixed forms of worship; and their simplicity and brevity, which distinguish them in these respects favorably from *later* productions, would seem to refer their origin to a very early period—as early, we think, as that to which they are referred by Mr. Sadler. Coleman's view respecting the use of the Lord's Prayer, in the early Church, is singularly suggestive. He says: "In every view of the subject the assertion that this prayer was used by the Apostles, or their immediate successors, must be regarded as arbitrary and groundless." This language is used in opposition to the views which he says were entertained by some writers, namely, "that it was a prescribed form, to be used, not only by His disciples, but by believers in every age and country," like the prescribed form "in which Baptism is to be administered"—"that it was an epitome of the Jewish Liturgy which was at that time extant"—"that the several parts of this prayer are supposed to be the very words in which the several prayers of the Jewish service began, and that the whole was embodied by our Lord as a substitute for so many long and unmeaning prayers." Having expressed his dissent from these views, he makes the following significant statement: "Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, fully concur in testifying to the use of the Lord's Prayer in the second and third centuries.—Tertullian declares it to be not only a form prescribed by Christ for all ages, but asserts that it contains the substance of all prayer, and is an epitome of the whole Gospel. Cyprian repeats much the same sentiments, acknowledging Tertullian as his guide and instructor, and often explaining more fully the sentiments of that author. He calls the Lord's Prayer—'Our Public and Common Prayer.' Origen also has a long treatise on the same subject, in which he says that this was a prescribed form containing all that the true Christian ever has occasion to pray for. Authorities without number, to the same effect may be accumulated from writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. The use of the Lord's Prayer, in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, was restricted to the faithful only, and was denied to

Catechumens. By Chrysostom it was styled '*Εὐχὴ τῶν Πιστῶν*'—the Prayer of the Faithful.'*"

In reference to the use of the responsive "AMEN" and of the "HALLELUJAH," Mr. Coleman gives the following account: "AMEN." This, in the phraseology of the church, is denominated 'orationis signaculum,' or 'devotæ conscionis Responsionem,' the token for prayer—the response of the worshipers. Justin Martyr is the first of the Fathers who speaks of the use of this response. In speaking of the Sacrament, he says, that at the close of the benediction and prayer, all the assembly respond 'AMEN,' which in the Hebrew tongue is the same as 'so let it be.' According to Tertullian, none but the faithful were permitted to join in the Response.—In the celebration of the Lord's Supper, especially, each communicant was required to give this Response in a tone of earnest devotion. Upon the reception, both of the bread and the wine, each uttered a loud 'AMEN,' and at the close of the consecration by the Priest, all (likewise) joined in shouting a loud 'AMEN.'—At the administration of Baptism, also, the witnesses and sponsors uttered this Response in the same manner.—'HALLELUJAH.' This was adopted from the Jewish Psalmody, particularly from those Psalms (cxiii.-cxviii.) which were sung at the Passover, called the 'Great Hallel,' or 'Hallel.' It was this that our Saviour sang with His disciples at the institution of the Sacrament. The word itself is an exhortation to praise God, and was so understood by Augustine, Isidorus, and others. The use of this phrase was first adopted by the Church at Jerusalem, and from this was received by other Churches. But the use of it was restricted to the fifty days between Easter and Whitsunday."†

The numerous other Liturgical forms, current in the early Church, which the author discusses, we shall not be able to review in this paper. They can be examined here, or in any other work on Christian Antiquities—especially in Bingham's great work, or in the work of Mr. Sadler already referred to, and used in connection with this discussion.

* Antiq. Chris. Ch., pp. 212, 216.

† Antiq. Chris. Ch., pp. 218, 219.

We here take leave of the two popular authors, Coleman and Sadler, standing as they do, at the two opposite poles of the theological world, and close this part of our subject by a few extracts from a more familiar, and, for the general reader, less suspicious author. Dr. Schaff,* in speaking of the worship of the early Christians, says: "The disciples assembled at first in the temple, and followed as closely as possible the venerable forms of the Jewish Cultus, which in truth were divinely ordained, and were an expressive type of the Christian worship. So far as we know, the Jewish Christians of the first generation, at least in Palestine, scrupulously observed the Sabbath, the annual Jewish feasts, and the whole Mosaic ritual, and celebrated, in addition to these, the Christian Sunday, the death and the resurrection of the Lord, and the Holy Supper." On the general subject of prayer, among the early Christians, our author speaks thus: "That, besides free prayer, according to special wants and circumstances, of which we have an example in the fourth chapter of Acts, they used also standing forms, may be inferred with certainty from the Jewish usage, from the Lord's direction respecting His model Prayer, from the strong sense of fellowship among the first Christians, and, finally, from the liturgical spirit of the ancient Church, which could not have so generally prevailed, both in the East and in the West, without some Apostolic and post-Apostolic precedent." In connection with his remarks on the Sacred SONG, "as a form of prayer, in the festive dress of poetry and the elevated language of inspiration," he also refers to the "specifically Christian psalms, hymns, doxologies, and benedictions," which entered into the worship of succeeding centuries, as well as "the lyrical and liturgical passages, the doxologies and antiphonies, of the Apocalypse."

On the responsive character of the primitive worship we quote the author's extract from Justin Martyr, who, in his Apology for the early Christians, giving a description of their Public Worship, as it stood about the year 139, beautifully says: "On Sunday a meeting of all who live in the cities and villages

* *Hist. of the Christian Church*, pp. 118, 120, 121.

is held, and a selection from the memoirs of the Apostles (the Gospels) and the writings of the prophets (the Old Testament) is read, as long as the time permits. When the reader has finished, the president, in a discourse, gives an exhortation to the imitation of these noble things. After this we all rise in Common Prayer. At the close of the prayer, as we have before described, bread and wine with water are brought. The president offers prayer and thanks for them, according to the power given him, and the congregation responds the 'AMEN.' "

On the expression, "according to the power given him," or "with all his might," as others translate it, Dr. Schaff, in an appended note, remarks that the passages or different renderings—"in no case contain any opposition to forms of prayer, which were certainly in use already at that time, and familiar without book to every worshiper; above all the Lord's Prayer. The whole liturgical literature of the fourth and fifth centuries presupposes a much older liturgical tradition. The prayers in the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions are probably among the oldest portions of the work."

After giving us Justin Martyr's beautiful description of the Holy Supper, with its "kiss of peace," and its offerings of "praise, and glory, and thanksgiving to the Father of all," its responsive "Amen" by the assembled worshipers, and its "customary collection" for the poor saints, our author makes the following just remarks: "We are not warranted in carrying back to this period the full liturgical service, which we find prevailing in striking uniformity in essentials, though with many variations in minor points, in all quarters of the Church in the Nicene age. A certain simplicity and freedom characterized the period before us. Even the so-called Clementine Liturgy, in the seventh book of the pseudo-Apostolical Constitutions, was probably not composed and written out in this form before the fourth century. Yet by the third century a tolerably uniform practice must have arisen, and spread by oral tradition; otherwise the later Liturgies were historically unaccountable."*

* Schaff's *Hist. Chris. Church*, pp. 332, 333, 391, 392.

That, in a general way, the views and sentiments here enunciated, and fully sustained by the several writers just quoted, were also generally adopted by the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, can, we think, be clearly and incontrovertibly established. The whole history of that extraordinary movement is characterized by a strongly-marked Church-feeling, and a constant recognition of the Liturgical spirit of the early or primitive Church.

The Lutheran Church, embracing, as it did, the greater portion of the European Continent, is, in its original form, wholly in favor of a Liturgical form of worship. The Church of England is notoriously on the same side; and has, in fact, always been one of the chief standard-bearers among the friends of a higher and more churchly form of Christianity. The Reformed Church, all the world over, was originally in favor of a Liturgy, although in the nature of the case, it was at no time so firmly and so steadily devoted to the use of a full and responsive service as the other two divisions of the Protestant Church already mentioned; and, it must be confessed, that several branches of the great Reformed family very soon became shaky and ingloriously surrendered their original position, as respects the use of an established order of worship in any way commensurate with the spirit of the primitive Church, or even of the Church of the Sixteenth Century. But that its original position was at least tolerably high, and that the spirit of this original position long lingered in the Church, and from time to time made itself felt, if not successfully, at least, in honest and earnest efforts suitably to regulate the public worship of God's house, can be clearly demonstrated and established by any amount of proof and of argument.*

Look, for instance, at France and French Switzerland, where the genius of Calvin first presided, and afterwards that of Beza, —the territory where Farel, flinging defiance at every form of ancient order and authority, and preaching, in fiery eloquence, against every thing, which, in his estimation, opposed the pro-

* For a masterly discussion of this whole subject, see Dr. Harbaugh's "CREED AND CULTUS," in Tercentenary Monument, pp. 231-295.

gress of the Gospel, or stood in the way of a radical reformation; and where, in the wide world, could you find a soil less suited for the growth of a liturgical, mild, and genial form of Divine Worship? And yet, here, in this uncongenial soil, and amidst these unfavorable circumstances, and under the supervision and by the agency mainly of the stern and relentless Calvin, a Liturgy was gotten up, as early as 1543, and for a long time was able to maintain its position in the Church. Look, too, at Switzerland proper, the land of free thought and independent action, where the more genial, but, at the same time, thoroughly radical Zwingli held undisputed sway during the opening period of the Reformation. One of the first things he did was to construct an order of worship or Liturgy (1525) for the administration of the Holy Communion. This service is distinguished for its admirable simplicity; and, what is so singular, is, that it is intensely responsive, in fact, wholly so from beginning to end. The service was either recited or chanted by the minister and the people antiphonally. The first sentence being spoken by the officiating minister, the other by the men, and the third by the women; and then the service, in its several parts, is continued alternately by the men and the women, the final response or solemn "AMEN," at the close, being spoken by the men and women conjointly. The Service includes, besides the Scripture Lessons, the words of institution, special prayers, and other minor points, the "Gloria in Excelsis," the "Apostles' Creed," the "Lord's Prayer," and the one hundred and thirteenth Psalm, and, finally, a brief thanksgiving, and the dismissal of the congregation.*

When, afterwards, a more thorough organization of the Reformed portion of the German Church took place in 1563, along with the Heidelberg Catechism, appeared also the Palatinate Liturgy—provision being thus made not only for the inculcation of sound doctrinal views, but, what was of equal importance, also, for the cultivation of a sound devotional spirit and the pure worship of God. That Liturgy is manifestly responsive

* For a translation of this oldest Reformed Liturgy, see *Mercersburg Review*, 1857, pp. 594-600.

in character, though less decidedly so than that of Zwingli. Provision, however, is made for the active participation of the people in some of the most solemn parts of the worship—being expressly called on to repeat with the minister certain portions of the service. In some of the later editions of this work, it is true, the language is toned down considerably, in some places; but even in the more recent copies of this Liturgy, as well as in other Manuals of Devotion, such as the different Church-Agendas, and especially in the Marburg Hymn Book, of 1746, —a copy of which, reprinted in 1770, is before us—does this responsive element make itself felt. Here we have, in fact, almost everything of an essential character that enters into the composition of our present Order of Worship, even down to the Litany, with its manifold responses, and hearty participation of all the worshippers.

The Scotch Church also had a Liturgy originally; but it soon went by the board. That this should be its fate under the peculiarly unfavorable influence exerted by the relentless spirit and fiery preaching of John Knox, is not at all strange. How could anything of a delicate and genial nature survive in the atmosphere of the stern, radical, and merciless activity of the Scotch Reformer! And yet the Presbyterians of the century following seem to have been more favorably inclined towards a judicious order of worship, as is seen in the repeated efforts which were made so to revise and modify the Book of Common Prayer as to adapt it to the use of the Presbyterian Churches of England.* Other evidences of the lingering remains of this

* Anton Wilhelm Boehmen's "Reformation der Kirche in England," pp. 635-654, 1042-1106. See also Dr. Krauth's "Liturgical Movement in the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches," *Mer. Review*, 1869, pp. 599-647; where the following works, bearing on this subject, are cited, namely:

(1) *Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies; Historical Sketches.* By a minister of the Presbyterian Church. 12mo. pp. 260.

(2) *A Book of Public Prayer.* Compiled from the authorized formularies of Worship of the Presbyterian Church, as prepared by the Reformers Calvin, Knox, Bucer, and others. With supplementary Forms. 12mo. pp. xxiii. 360.

(3) *A Manual of Worship,* suitable to be used in Legislative and other public bodies, in the army, &c. Compiled from the forms, and in accordance with the common usages of all Christian Denominations, &c., 18mo. pp.—

liturgical spirit, which originally pervaded the entire Protestant Church, are furnished by the ever recurring efforts made both in England and on the Continent to get up suitable manuals for the conduct of Public Worship. New bodies of Christians, springing up from time to time, exhibited more or less of this original spirit. So, for instance, the Methodist Episcopal Church early adopted an order of worship very much like that of the Church of England from which they had seceded. The edition of 1784, which lately fell in our way, appears, from the cursory examination we could give it, to be but a revised and expurgated reprint of the English Liturgy. We have also in our possession a German translation of a Liturgy of the Methodist Episcopal Church, printed, according to a statement made in the preface, in 1804, and published in German by the advice of Bishop Asbury and the Philadelphia Conference, in 1808, which contains full and appropriate offices for the administration of the Sacraments, the ordination of Church officers, and other ministerial acts, special and ordinary.

Besides the several Christian bodies of a later date, already referred to, we must yet mention the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, or Moravians, for whose use a very full and excellent Liturgy was prepared and is still extant. And with these good people the Liturgy is not a dead letter or useless relic. Practically it forms the very life and soul of their religious worship. They use it constantly in connection with their Sunday and other services; and use it, as every Liturgy ought to be used, *responsively*—entering with a spirit of most earnest devotion and fervent piety into these beautiful offices of Divine Worship.

Consider, also, the whole structure of German Christianity, with its Sunday and Holy-day services always running in the order of the Church-year, with its glorious old Chants and Hymns and Sacred Carols, its Manuals of Worship, and Prayer

(4) The Book of Common Prayer, as amended by the Westminster Divines, A. D. 1661. Edited by Charles W. Shields, D.D. With a Historical and Liturgical Treatise. 12mo. pp. xxiv. 637, 168.

Books for the use and edification of pastor and people, its huge volumes of practical sermons on the Gospels, and Epistles, its thorough Catechetical instructions, and solemn confirmation and communion services; and, then, say whether or not these things are of the same order with what now claims to be the only legitimate succession of Evangelical Protestant Christianity. Alas, the bare mention of such a pretence is rank with absurdity. Between the Protestantism of the Sixteenth Century and this modern one-sided reproduction of it, "there is a great gulf fixed," and the judgment of this latter, on the subject in hand, is of little or no account when pitted against the sounder and vastly more Scriptural views and sentiments of the Sixteenth Century, and, still less so, when alleged against the Liturgical spirit and earnest faith of the primitive Church, touching on the Apostolic period, and all aglow with the zeal and fervor of its first love!

Even in the most recent times, the Church in Europe, distracted and weakened, as it is, by the extensive prevalence of Rationalism, yet deeply feeling its serious departure from the faith and practice of the fathers, has shown some signs of a desire to return again to the ancient and better state, which the Rationalistic age had repudiated in favor of its bald intellectualism and sugar-coated infidelity. Strenuous efforts in this direction were made only a few years ago in Switzerland, and quite recently in France. And singularly enough, in both instances, the conservative and believing part of the Church proposed restoring again to the people a portion, at least, of their Liturgical worship and churchly inheritance—the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, and the offices for the celebration of the Holy Communion; the very things for which many earnest and devoted men in the Reformed Church of this country have been contending for years amidst fierce opposition, abuse, and endless misrepresentation.

This violent opposition on the part of many, has been aroused and their unchristian conduct justified, ostensibly, on the ground of a fancied agreement between the early Reformed Liturgies and their own arbitrary and unchurchly version, or *perversion*,

rather of their genuine teachings; but no presumption could will be wider of the mark than this. That these early Reformed documents contain a full responsive service, such as we find in the Order of Worship, for instance, no one pretends to say. Had there been any such Liturgy at hand, surely no efforts would have been made to get up a new one. The old Palatinate Liturgy was found to be defective in some respects, and wholly unsuited to the exigencies of the present time; hence the effort to construct a new Order of Worship, which should meet, if possible, the wants of the present advanced state of the Church. That such changes and improvements in the outward forms of worship are perfectly consistent with the original spirit and genius of the Reformed Church, as well as with her constant practice in past ages, is too manifest to admit of an argument. Any one doubting this fact can fully satisfy himself by examining the exhaustive article of Dr. Krauth, referred to in the note on a preceding page. On this very ground, indeed, we have admitted, that in the later issues of the Palatinate Liturgy, for instance, the language, in reference to several important points, is toned down considerably. But it must be remembered that these admitted changes in the later worship were made during the darkest and most dismal period in the history of the Reformed Church. The heartless and stern intellectualism of the Seventeenth Century naturally called forth a reactionary movement in the form of Pietism; and this subjective pietism, however valid and praiseworthy as over against a lifeless formalism, gradually and just as naturally passed over into a practical depreciation and disregard of the Church Formularies; and, finally, when its unsubstantial fires were fully expended, just as naturally again, into the cold and dreary regions of Rationalism. Along with the repudiation of the established forms of worship or Liturgy the life and doctrines enshrined in those consecrated forms, also, went by the board. Whether the gradual decline of the early Liturgical spirit, and the general disrelish for such an evangelical order of worship, produced the cold and dreary system of Neology, or whether Rationalism, with its practical rejection of Jesus Christ and

His redeeming work, was father to the prevailing disrelish of these sound and evangelical forms of worship, in which the great facts of redemption were constantly held up and firmly asserted, is a matter of no consequence. Enough that the two movements—a gradual decline in Liturgical worship, on the one hand, and the steady growth of Rationalism, on the other hand, ran parallel with each other; and, finally, ended in the almost total subversion of Christianity and the Church.

But, in the midst of all these changes, the original Liturgical spirit, as we have above remarked, still continued to exist and to make itself felt; and the consequence was, that, during all those dreary ages, as well as in the times more immediately subsequent to the Reformation period, Liturgies or fixed forms of worship, though of different degrees of merit, occasionally made their appearance. And when there was apparently no formal Liturgy at hand for the use of the Church, the necessary elements for a Liturgical service were gathered up and embodied in their current Hymn-Books. Of this fact any amount of evidence can be furnished. Such a massive work as that of Dr. Daniel, for instance, entitled "*Codex Liturgicus*" is alone sufficient to put the question forever at rest. It is an admirable and enduring monument, both of the industry of the learned author, and of the extensive prevalence and extraordinary fruitfulness of the Liturgical spirit in the Protestant Churches of Continental Europe, and forms, in connection with Dr. Ebrard's more recent work on the same general subject, an unanswerable argument in favor of a fixed and permanent order of worship in the Church of Christ.

What we have now been trying to show in this paper, is, that the ancient Jewish Church had a divinely appointed and fixed order of worship in use, first, in the Tabernacle, and, then, in the Temple, during a period of fifteen hundred years—that the more devotional parts of this divinely established order, though in a somewhat modified and more popular form, were transferred to the synagogue, at its establishment in the time of Ezra, or soon after—that our blessed Saviour and His Apostles stately worshiped in these ancient and venerable forms,

both in the Synagogue and in the Temple—that many incidental references and casual allusions, scattered throughout the New Testament Scriptures, give sufficient intimations of the constant recurrence of such common or united services, among the disciples, as a fixed order of worship, whether written or unwritten, alone secures, and that they, especially in their public assemblies, used the responsive “AMEN,” according to ancient Jewish Custom (Acts ii. 42; Rom. xv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 16,)—that this style of worship, ‘praying with the spirit, and praying with the understanding also,’ on the part of the Apostolic Church, was the legitimate fruit and outgrowth of the divinely ordained worship of God’s ancient people, which, like the entire system of which it formed a part, was, in its very nature and design, *typical*, and thus preparatory to the New Testament order of things—that this advanced Christian state, with all its services, was again preparatory to the heavenly worship, which, as we have seen from the vision of St. John, is intensely responsive, and thus furnishes presumptive evidence, at least, that the worship on earth, which is designed to prepare us for the heavenly worship, is, and, of right, should be responsive—that the primitive Church, immediately succeeding that of the holy Apostles and their “companions in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ,” worshiped in fixed and highly responsive forms of devotion, as fully certified by a multitude of Liturgies still extant, early originated and used in the most distant and widely-separated countries, embracing the whole primitive Christian world—that the spirit of these early Liturgies, at least, if not their forms also, were generally recognized by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and embodied to some extent in their own respective Liturgies or Manuals of Devotion, and, that, during the ages subsequent to the Reformation, this Liturgical spirit constantly existed and made itself felt, from time to time, both in Continental Europe and in England, as also in this country, measurably, at least, during the earliest period of the existence of the Reformed Church; and, that, on the ground of this uninterrupted and well nigh universal prevalence of Liturgical worship in the Church

of Christ, we are fully warranted to regard the use of fixed, established, and responsive forms in the worship of God, both legitimate and eminently Scriptural.

How far we have succeeded in our attempt to make good these several points, and so to establish our general position, we leave to the honest and unbiased judgment of our readers to decide. Our argument, especially as to its main features, is strictly Scriptural; and on this solid foundation of God's everlasting Word, interpreted, not in the spirit of a national camp-meeting or of a New England thanksgiving-day, but in the ineffable light and glory of its own Super-human History, we confidently rest the cause of Liturgical Worship.

Honestly and earnestly, but in this only true and legitimate sense and use of the Sacred Writings, do we appeal "to the law and to the testimony," in our argument with those who differ from us; "if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them." Truth only is worth being contended for. Every thing that is merely human and ephemeral must eventually pass away; "but the Word of the Lord abideth forever."

ART. III.—THE SCOPE AND SPIRIT OF SCIENTIFIC
RESEARCH.*

BY W. LEAMAN, ESQ., LANCASTER, PA.

FELLOW Alumni of Franklin and Marshall College : Ladies and Gentlemen:—

When, a few weeks ago, I was informed that Judge Mayer, who had intended addressing you to-night, would be unable to be present in consequence of feeble health, and that I should be expected to act in his place, it was natural for me to indulge in a brief retrospect. Reverting to the time of graduation, when *Alma Mater* was left with such equipment for life as I was able to carry from her, and glancing over the years that have since passed, I took an inventory of acquisitions made in the interval for the purpose of discovering whether I had anything to furnish on any topic of so general a character as to be appropriate to the present occasion. And truly the gleanings appeared so pitiful a handful, that my first impulse was to reject the task as having nothing worthy to offer you. But as we may easily paralyze ourselves by a too rigid self-criticism, it occurred to me that you might possibly be somewhat interested, were I to give you some thoughts and impressions on the scope and spirit of scientific research which have been gathered in the course of rather miscellaneous and desultory readings other than professional, in which natural bent was consulted and followed. It is not my intention to enlarge upon any of the special doctrines or logical methods of science, but to examine with brevity some of the larger ideas which pervade all its operations, the attitude it assumes toward the general body of knowledge, the mental atmosphere in which it habitually dwells, the moods and emotions it produces, the sympathies

* Alumni Address delivered at Lancaster, Pa., June 24th, 1873. Published by request of Society.

and antipathies it arouses. I wish to act the part of a reporter, not of an advocate or a judge. And I hope the theme may not be esteemed one of too high argument, as it seems to have a fitness for the time. For science claims to rule the hour and the era, and that it will continue to hold the dominion of the future. A body of disciplined students are engaged in observing, collating, combining and generalizing facts in all special departments. From these the most important results are taken, and receiving popular and lucid exposition, at length reach the magazines and the corners of the daily newspapers, until each of us may, if it seem fitting, procure a modicum of pangenesis, protoplasm, natural selection, evolution, or whatever may be the last explanation. Scientific theories and teachings are in the process of infiltrating and permeating the whole of society, exciting reflection, disturbing received opinions, meeting in some quarters enthusiastic agreement, and rejected in others with intense repugnance and reprobation. Not only are the intellectual and thoughtful minds being reached, but many of the undisciplined and thoughtless. Shakspeare's melancholy Jaques, who laughed, *sans* intermission, an hour by his dial, at the motley fool who moraled on the time, might now find much food for his merriment, and his lungs might crow like chanticleer.

'That fools should be so deep contemplative.'

Doubtless the antics and arrogance of many sciolists who caper in the garb of science are ridiculous enough; but notwithstanding, these are among the signs of the advent and influx of new thoughts, which must be met and examined by all of us who think at all; and either accepted with important modifications of many beliefs, or combated to the best of our abilities. We cannot shout our old and hereditary opinions so loudly; we cannot so fill our ears with conservative cotton, as not to be penetrated by the thinking of the time. The terror produced in many minds will not arrest scientific progress, which is neither to be stopped nor intimidated by indignant protests. Mr. Parke Godwin, of the New York *Evening Post*, at the farewell banquet given to Professor Tyndall prior to his depar-

ture for England, in a speech which has been much quoted and lauded, attempted to draw the line between true and false science, assigning to scientific inquiry what he considers its legitimate scope, and saying 'hitherto come, but no farther.' But science will pay but little attention to this, or any similar call to halt. It will persevere in penetrating the territory of knowledge in all directions, adding field to field, in spite of barriers erected and boundaries marked out by outsiders who presume to prescribe its limits. "I have taken all knowledge to be my province," said the first great organizer of scientific methods, Francis Bacon, then in his youth, with calm self-reliance. His followers, too, have taken all the knowledge to be their province, believing with Goethe, that "Nature has no secret which she does not somewhere lay bare before the eyes of the attentive observer." In order to appreciate these claims, let us get a clear idea of what is meant by science. The most adequate conception which has been reached, is that which fundamentally identifies science with common knowledge, with those rude classifications of facts and experiences which are carried on by children and savages. It reduces this common knowledge to exactness and then proceeds to organize the more complex, remote and recondite phenomena with similar precision, or at least with all the definiteness of which they are capable, for equal certitude is not possible in all the departments of science. It will not rest merely in the region of physical truth, but, traversing that, rises to chemical truth, and extends itself into the phenomena of life, of mind, and of society. But science does not cease with the orderly arrangement of phenomena as they exist at the present time into groups and classes according to the observed relations of likeness and difference; it also examines and considers how the present has grown out of the past, and to what goal things are progressing. Facts must be co-ordinated, not only as they exist together, but as they succeed one another with reference to community of causation. Science classifies, for instance, the present statical relations of the solar system, as a part of its work in the field of Astronomy; states how world is balanced against world,

and with telescope and spectroscope shows the external appearances and chemical constitution of the planets and suns about us. It does more. It traces out their origin and development, in accordance with the known laws of matter and motion, from a diffused float, through cycles of aggregation, accretion and separation until existing conditions are reached. We here come upon the Nebular Hypothesis. Again Geology does not stop with ascertaining the contemporaneous physical aspects of the planet which we inhabit, 'a star among the stars,' but goes back through the recesses of a far past when the earth assumed an independent existence, and follows up the transformations effected by the slow, unceasing, processes of condensation, stratification, upheaval by igneous action, denudation, deposition, and solar influences, until we come upon the present distribution and composition of land, water and climate. Then dealing with the subtle permutations and combinations of chemical atoms and forces, science ascends higher and lays its hands upon the problem of the origin of life, and now wrestles with its solution. For it considers life to be a concrete phenomenon, and as such, though the task may be vastly difficult, susceptible of explanation and definition like any other. After life, the germ of protoplasm, has been reached, the special living forms must be accounted for. This Mr. Darwin attempts to do by his theory of the origin of the species by natural selection. But man himself is a special living form, and again we have Mr. Darwin with an explanation of his descent. The facts of mind are dealt with in a similar manner. Psychology does not merely analyze and classify the mental powers of the adult civilized man, but, by uniting the experience of the individual with the experience of all ancestral minds, attempts to furnish a complete interpretation of the phenomena of consciousness, including the intuitions of Space and Time, the so-called Forms of Thought, and Necessary Truths. Further, a man is not only a unit, he is one of mankind, and as such an object of Science. And, at this very hour, a great thinker is elaborating a Science of Society, a Sociology as it has been termed, which shall furnish a philosophy of his-

tory, an explanation of the facts of aggregated human life, and the laws of social well-being. The effort may be only initiatory and tentative, and the future may have to set much of it aside, but it illustrates, with clearness, scientific aims and tendencies. The most sacred beliefs of men must pass the test of scientific examination. The grounds of a belief in a Personal First Cause; the existence of an immortal life after the death of the body; and the claims and credentials of any professed revelation, will receive critical scrutiny. In a periodical so common and so extensively circulated as '*Littell's Living Age*,' have appeared Max Mueller's dissertations on the "Science of Religion!" Then again, taking the highest and widest generalizations supplied by its special departments, and the profoundest analytical truths which have been obtained, Science furnishes the basis and data of a synthetic philosophy which aims at giving, in a general body of doctrine, an explanation of the totality of phenomena. This philosophy, having its roots deep down in common knowledge, and using the faculties employed in the acquisition of that common knowledge, and constantly making application to a psychology which sits central among the sciences, itself a science, strives to establish a theory of the Universe which shall exclude all unverifiable appeals to intuition, revelation, or supernatural light, and which, in the most elevated regions of thought, and on all ultimate questions, shall secure the same certainty which we have in the lower range of the senses and of immediate perception. For scientific thought gives but little heed to the assumptions of philosophers, who ascend the tripod and ray forth oracles without condescending to render reasons saving that their utterances appear to them to be true and consistent. All thinking must be brought to the crucial test and scrutiny of the ascertained laws of thought, to stand or fall under the application of rigorous logical methods. A certain Frenchman could not demonstrate to his friend that the earth turns round the sun, but he was willing to pass him his word of honor as an assurance that it does. The guarantee might be considered unsatisfactory. Beyond doubt, in matters of science, the word of honor carries but little weight. Science,

therefore, claims that its limits are con-terminous with the powers of the human mind for attaining definite knowledge, and will not stop short of that goal. It is an organized mass of facts, ever growing, and ever being purified from errors. Not that it expects to find out all things unto perfection. Science asserts the existence of a transcendent Force, an ultimate and Primeval Power which is inscrutable and unknowable, and of which all phenomena are but the manifestations. It makes the admission, or rather the distinct affirmation, that "positive knowledge does not, and never can, fill the whole region of possible thought. At the uttermost reach of discovery there arises, and must ever arise, the question—What lies beyond? As it is impossible to think of a limit to space so as to exclude the idea of space lying outside that limit, so we cannot conceive of any explanation profound enough to exclude the question—What is the explanation of that explanation?" Knowledge cannot monopolize consciousness; it must always continue possible for the mind to dwell upon that which transcends knowledge." It recognizes an enduring reality which supports all appearances, which is constant under all the changing phenomena.

"The eternal Pan,
Who layeth the world's incessant plan,
Halteth never in one shape,
But forever doth escape
Into new forms."

But here its attitude ceases to be intellectual and definitely cognitive and becomes emotional. Of that Universal Power nothing is asserted except that it exists and that it underlies all experience. It is wholly inconceivable. Scientific research feels itself impotent in the presence of a vast mystery, and makes no proposition regarding it. Science does not deny anything, but it cannot affirm anything, and reverently puts its finger on its lips.

Rejecting, then, the arbitrary assignment of boundaries, and at the same time recognizing the vanity of all attempts to compass absolute knowledge, Science accepts the limits of the finite human mind, and confines itself to the relative and knowable.

Within this area, the conception of *Law* presides over all scientific inquiry. That there is a fixed course of procedure, an order which changes not, in the manifestations of Force, in all events and phenomena throughout the universe, including those of volition, is a conception that science cannot for a moment let fall. The idea is not the product of any particular science, nor of any one line of thought, but of all sciences, and all lines of thought therein. Finding uniformity of relations wherever he has observed, compared and experimented, and looking upon facts not yet organized as matters for future organization, the man of science expects everywhere to find invariable connection and sequence, and cannot believe in, or conceive of, lawless phenomena. There is no chance. There is no fate. But the iron chain of an inexorable necessity runs through all phenomena, in which each effect is linked to its cause by indissoluble bonds. Job's description of the scaly harness of Leviathan might be applied to this rigid cohesion of cause and effect. "One is so near to another that no air can come between them. They are joined one to another, they stick together that they cannot be sundered." This conception of Law excludes all idea of interference. There is no break, no flaw, no unforeseen contingency to be provided for. These laws, sacred from all violation, execute themselves. Introduce any agency external to the universal order, which intervenes in any crisis, or at any instant, or any incalculable agency which is co-working or inter-working with the operation of natural and measurable forces, and there is introduced an unverifiable element. Scientific certainty disappears. In any given effect which may be observed, it becomes impossible to assert what proportion of the result is assignable to the natural causes, and what to the external or alleged co-operating agency. Just as science would become impossible, could either matter or motion arise out of nothing, or disappear into nothing, so it would become impossible if a factor, were admitted, whose operation cannot be known and measured.

Under this pervading conception of the universality of Law, Science everywhere looks for the persistent connection among

things. "The fashion of the world passeth away," writes Goethe, whose mind was profoundly scientific as well as poetic. "I wish to busy myself only with relations that are permanent, and thus give to my mind its first experience of eternity." Science searches for the 'Eternal Verities,' as Carlyle calls them. Truth is its only object. It cannot rest in illusions, but must "see the object as in itself it really is." In that beautiful book, 'Thorndale; or the Conflict of Opinions,' Seckendorf, who represents the spirit of Denial, defends the illusions of mankind, holding that they furnish stimulation and active motive power, and also enfold and disguise the harsh realities of the world and the impotence of man in dealing with them, thus helping to reconcile him to his lot, and to make the rolling years endurable. And it may be the business of poetry to create such, to put out of sight the disagreeable appearances and bring into prominence only the beautiful aspects of things, and even

"To add the gleam,

The light that never was on land and sea."

But science dispels illusions, looks at the object through no diffracting media, but places it in a dry, colorless light. It pursues truth regardless of consequences, and no matter how uninviting its appearance at first may be. "We must follow truth, though it lead to Hades," is its motto. What an amount of adverse and repugnant feeling has been called out by Darwin's theory of the "Descent of Man!" Much of the criticism seems to consist of emotional protests against a history of man's origin, which appears unutterably degrading to him. But science calmly investigates the hypothesis for the sole purpose of ascertaining whether it be true or false, complete or incomplete, and leaves our dignity to take care of itself, knowing full well that, if true, it must be accepted, and that the human mind will find some way of becoming reconciled to the result.

Then again Science is affirmative and constructive, not negative and destructive. It seeks to build up not to pull down. This portion of its spirit is perhaps best discernible in its attitude towards the old and the new, the past and the present,

historically considered. The present cannot suddenly sever its connection with the past. They are causally connected. The beliefs of to-day are the offspring of those of yesterday, and the parent of those of to-morrow. The errors of men cannot be suddenly destroyed by negative criticism, but must be exuviated and cast aside by new truth. The scientist does not go about pointing out to men the absurdities and logical incongruities of their dogmas and creeds. He regards the existing opinions and social institutions as the appropriate results of historic growth, as the inevitable products of the time. Mr. Lecky, in his '*History of Rationalism*,' shows that ancient beliefs, such as, for instance, those respecting magic and witchcraft, have not perished so much from direct logical assaults and definite arguments, as from an incompatibility with a standard of belief created, not by the influences arising out of any one department of intellect, but by the combination of all the intellectual and even social tendencies of an age. All these influences generated, as it were, an atmosphere of thought in which the old beliefs could not live. They died of inanition. The scientist recognizes the truth of this. Opinions and institutions may justly live as long as they can. 'The teeth,' it has been remarked, 'are hard and painful to extract in youth, but in old age they fall out of themselves.' Or the matter may be illustrated by the analogy of the process of growth conspicuous in the common sycamore tree. Look under it at certain seasons and you will find the ground scattered with fragments of rind shed from the tree. Observe the cause. A new growth has silently formed beneath the old bark and made room for itself by casting it aside without laceration or violent effort. In this manner, the scientist would have the present arise out of the past. But he is at the same time courageous, and when properly called upon fearlessly expresses his beliefs without mental reservation, leaving them to work what effect they may. He extends the area of positive knowledge to the best of his ability, and then patiently waits until it prevails throughout society. In this spirit all great men have worked in whatever field, who were more careful to lay the foundations of a new

state of things, than of overturning the old one. And this attitude is the marked characteristic of the scientific inquiry of the day, differing in this respect from the radical iconoclasm of the last century. The thinking of that time, as exhibited most conspicuously in France, was almost wholly negative and destructive. It constructed nothing, and whatever was useful in it lay in the fact that old errors were swept away and the ground prepared and cleaned for new truth.

Again, science works in a spirit of profound humility. Towards dogma, towards mere authority, its attitude may be haughty, but toward fact and truth it is humble. As says Professor Tyndall of inductive inquiry, "It requires patient industry and an humble and conscientious acceptance of what Nature reveals. The first condition of success is an honest receptivity and a willingness to abandon preconceived notions, however cherished, if they be found to contradict the truth. Believe me, a self renunciation which has something noble in it, and of which the world never hears, is often enacted in the private experiences of the true votary of Science." This characteristic of men of science received eminent illustration in the case of Newton, when testing his discovery of the law of gravitation. Having reached the hypothesis that matter attracts matter directly as the mass, and inversely as the square of the distance, he proceeded to verify it by ascertaining whether it corresponded with the order of observed facts. According to the theory, the moon, at the distance then calculated, in its revolution round the earth must be deflected fifteen feet each minute from the direction of a right line. But observation showed that the deflection was but thirteen feet each minute. Finding this discrepancy, Newton laid aside his hypothesis for many years as inadequate to explain the phenomena. Subsequently, however, it was discovered that the distance of the moon had been incorrectly estimated. Newton then resumed his calculations, and found, after making the necessary corrections, that the law as stated would require that the moon be deflected from its rectilinear path thirteen feet each minute as observation had shown to be the case. Thus was the theory

established as the law of gravitation. What a religious self-abnegation was witnessed during those years! What a submission of the pride of intellect to the facts of the universe! For it is difficult in thinking as in conduct to purge ourselves of all selfish considerations. Read the papers on the subject of Sociology appearing currently in the "Popular Science Monthly," and you will get a conception of the obstacles in the way of reaching a perfectly unbiased point of view. Our minds are infested with what Bacon calls "Idols," which can only be got rid of by the most attentive watchfulness, a constant self-denying effort, which itself constitutes a culture of the highest kind. Whoso will search for the truth in the spirit of Science must become as a little child, must have the same freedom from prepossessions, the same sincerity, openness and docility of mind.

Again science works in a spirit of deep *faith*. Of course the word is not used in any restricted theological sense, but as expressing that reverent submission to, and acquiescence in, truth, believing that it is good. Science holds that the profoundest skepticism and infidelity are the idea that the truth can be bad. It was said before that science seeks truth, fearless of consequences, that truth must be followed even if it lead to Hades. But there is no fear that it will lead to Hades. Its face is turned in a quite opposite direction. Science throws itself upon proved and demonstrated truth, upon the abstract law, adhering to it in spite of all adverse appearances. It holds that truth is something distinct from ourselves, something immutable, which it is our business to ascertain, and when ascertained, unquestioningly conform to, for in that conformity will be found our truest happiness and most perfect life. Science sees that nothing can be permanently accomplished except by working in harmony with law. No amount of cunning ingenuity or courage, will enable us to fight successfully the laws of the world. Obedience is the highest prudence, the truest heroism, the greatest wisdom, the deepest religion. Its aspiration might be emotionally expressed in the language which Matthew Arnold is fond of translating from a Greek poet:

"O that my lot may lead me in the path which august laws ordain, laws that in the highest empyrean had their birth, of which Heaven is the father alone, neither did the race of mortal men beget, nor shall oblivion ever put them to sleep. The power of God is mighty in them, and groweth not old."

An excellent illustration of this scientific faith in the abstract is furnished by Spencer's "Social Statics." The work may be called a Geometry of Morals. Starting from a first principle, immediately recognized by the "Moral Sense," and also inductively established, he proceeds to logically develop it into a series of propositions which shall serve for our guidance in all the departments of social life. All considerations of expediency are put aside, or only called in for the collateral purposes of argument and illustrative proof, and to show how the first principle involves them. He is willing to trust society to the ascertained law, without foresight of consequences, but in the implicit faith that conformity thereto will produce the highest and best possible results. In the concluding paragraph of the remarkable treatise referred to, he says, "And thus, in teaching a uniform unquestioning obedience, does an entirely abstract philosophy become one with all true religion. Fidelity to conscience—this is the essential precept inculcated by both. No hesitation, no paltering about probable results, but an implicit submission to what is believed to be the law laid down for us. We are not to pay lip homage to principles which our conduct willfully transgresses. We are not to follow the example of those who taking '*Domine dirige nos*' for their motto, yet disregard the directions given, and prefer to direct themselves. We are not to be guilty of that practical atheism, which seeing no guidance for human affairs but its own limited foresight, endeavors itself to play the god, and decide what will be good for mankind, and what bad. But, on the contrary, we are to search out with a genuine humility the rules ordained for us—are to do unfalteringly, without speculating as to consequences, whatsoever these require; and we are to do this in the belief that then, when there is perfect sincerity—when each man is true to himself,—when every one strives to realize what he

thinks the highest rectitude—then must all things prosper." This tone of courageous faith, expressed in relation to one of its highest departments, is characteristic of science throughout its whole extent. Again, science aims at being eminently practical. It strives to strengthen man, to make him more adequate to his situation, and to enable him to fight the battle of life more securely. It does not delight to dwell on the negative aspects of human nature, on the imbecility, depravity, or ignorance of man, but searching for such potencies as may be in him, fortifies these, and, by disclosing the conditions in his environment which he must seek or avoid in order to secure good or escape evil, enlarges the range of his adaptation. It is its ultimate function to furnish infallible guidance for all our actions, physical, intellectual and moral, not by giving guesses and opinions, but by showing the uniform connections of co-existence and sequence among surrounding facts, and by discovering the laws, conformity to which will necessarily produce the greatest personal and social happiness. When the more complex, remote and recondite relations of phenomena are distinctly pointed out, and clearly held before our minds, they will guide our conduct with as much certainty as we are now guided by our direct knowledge; for instance, as by our experience that fire will burn, or that bread will nourish.

Though very imperfectly elaborated, such are the scope, spirit and aims of scientific inquiry as I have been able to apprehend them! I may have misconceived the real nature of the subject, and therefore reported incorrectly. I can only be sure that I have given what I have received.

And now let us glance at the mental attitude of those not professedly scientific towards the doctrines of science. Much disturbance of thought and feeling is to be looked for. For it is a truth "that in every man, and in every generation of men, there is a certain inevitable connection of opinions. We hold our views by sets and series. If we espouse one, we will unconsciously let in along with this a little, or it may be a long train of others. A man comes to a conclusion upon some greatly controverted point of science. His eye has possibly never turned aside from the

straitened bounds of scientific matter, and yet his single conclusion here leads him insensibly to a whole parcel of conclusions in religious matter or in ethical matter." Changes of opinion, and tone and habit of thought may be wrought in indirect and unexpected ways. Fifty years ago, John Foster, in his "Essay on Popular Ignorance," congratulated himself on the increased introduction of machinery in the mechanical employments, as it would make the laboring classes understand that there is such a thing as physical law, and thus assist in dispelling from their minds superstitious beliefs in omens, charms and witchcraft. And now Dr. Bushnell explains that machinery has so familiarized the same classes with the unyielding laws of matter, that they are led to expect the same fixity in all phenomena, and have no room in their thinking for the supernatural.

Besides every Intellectual belief gathers round it its appropriate feeling, and when the belief is disturbed, suffering is aroused emotionally. The condition of doubt is painful. And these emotions are beyond the control of the individual. They have become a part of him without his consent, and spring up spontaneously under the fitting circumstances. De Quincey shows that the agitation and sorrow of Eloisa under her sin would have been impossible to a vestal virgin of Rome, but was natural and necessary to her, enveloped as she was by the religious atmosphere of Christianity. Now Science, in that part of it which is merely classificatory, does not excite any antagonism or alarm. Botany and Zoology may go on arranging their groups and subgroups, and no protest will be uttered. But it is when we come to the sciences which assume to account for the concrete forms; or when the large generalizations of scientific philosophy are reached, that existing and inherited beliefs are invaded and painful feelings aroused. Such is the case when Darwin promulgates his theory of the "Descent of Man," and when Spencer announces his sweeping and universal law of evolution. These are at once perceived to be at variance with many existing opinions, creeds and philosophies, and opposition and aversion are instantly excited. To many

of the best minds of the day, imbued with theology, science and religion appear utterly irreconcilable. To them science appears to be tending headlong toward a materialism, dark, desolate and hopeless, in which all man's noblest thoughts and aspirations shall be dissolved as baseless dreams, leaving a morality of "Eat and drink to-day, for to-morrow we die." On the lower ground of literature, which reflects the more general feeling of the public as affected by the new thinking the expression of despondent moods is frequent, at times freighting the lines of poets with a delicious and infectious melancholy. Tennyson, who sings hopefully in "Locksley Hall," in his "In Memoriam," in which many meditations on life, on man's hopes and beliefs, pass through the shadow of a great sorrow, attains but a struggling faith,

"Behold we know not anything;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all,
And every win or change to spring.

So runs my dream; but what am I?
An infant crying in the night;
An infant crying for the light;
And with no language but a cry."

Again he sickens with the unceasing turmoil and conflict of opinions, and longs for the conscious calm of the "Lotos-Eaters," in a "land in which it seemed always afternoon," to rest and "never wander more." And lastly in a recent sonnet he inquires,

"Is there anything worth the knowing?"

The delicately refined William Morris turns from the problems of the time, "I cannot ease the burden of your fears," is his apology. But he essays to give a few moments of oblivion, and sings a song so enchanting that while you listen you forget

But it is needless to extend the range of illustration. These are but the utterances of widely-prevalent moods. In the midst of the doubts and confusions of this transitional time, Science holds it must continue to calmly do its appointed work. It can but urge loyalty to truth, believing that what is such will

in the end survive, and that the truth cannot be evil, nor produce evil. "Fear not the new generalization," says the deep-minded Emerson. "Does the fact look crass and material, threatening to degrade thy theory of spirit? Resist it not; it goes to refine and raise thy theory of matter just as much." Science has its eye on the future, and holds that the highest point of view which the mind of man is capable of attaining will be sufficient for him, giving satisfaction to his thought, stilling doubt, allaying every fear, harmonizing all discord. It feels assured that in the end all will be well, for it is clear that existing beliefs and institutions can only be permanently supplanted, if supplanted at all, by higher ones. Science is full of hope, knowing that,—

"Through the ages one increasing purpose runs."

And the thoughts of men are widened by the process of the suns.

ART. IV.—THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM AS TAUGHT IN THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

BY THE REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D.

OF late the doctrine concerning the Sacrament of Holy Baptism has received special consideration, and called forth earnest discussions, both within the pale of the Reformed Church and to some extent also among other denominations, occasioned chiefly by the able article of the Rev. Mr. Rupp on Regeneration and Conversion. These discussions afford new evidence of the fact that the rationalistic tendencies of the prevailing theology have supplanted the old Protestant faith in the Sacraments as appointed means of divine grace. Claiming to be the faithful representative of Reformation ideas, the religious press of our day, generally at least, denies, respecting the efficacy and necessity of Baptism, what the most authoritative Confessions of the Protestant Church with one voice affirm, and affirms what these confessions explicitly

deny. Baptism is the seal of regeneration and of the forgiveness of sins. So these confessions of the sixteenth century all teach; and in this respect they are in harmony with the faith of the Church catholic in every age. But the religious press of our day commonly affirms that Holy Baptism is at most only a significant religious ceremony. The ceremony *symbolizes* forgiveness and the renewing grace of the Holy Spirit; but the subject of Baptism, whether infant or adult, is not made a partaker of any positive spiritual gift through the medium of the Sacrament itself.

Taking the leading confessions of the Reformation period as the standard of true Protestantism, these low views of the Sacraments, and particularly of Holy Baptism, must be set down as unprotestant. They are the modern form of Socinian error.

In the Reformed Church the discussion of the historical question revolves around the Heidelberg Confession. What does this most authoritative formulary of the original Reformed faith teach? Has it any sympathy with Socinian unbelief? Does it give any support to the rationalistic opinions of the last century and of the present day? Or do its teachings harmonize with the faith of the Church as perpetuated from age to age in every branch of her communion?

To this general question we will endeavor to furnish an answer. Let us interrogate the Catechism itself. It devotes six questions to the subject of Baptism. These we propose to take up and consider in regular succession.

The more general doctrine of the Reformed Church, as taught in all her confessions, we presented in an article published in this Review, April, 1868, where the reader will find a collation of the teachings of all branches of the Reformed Church—Swiss, French, German, Scotch, Belgic, and other nationalities. They all affirm substantially the same view of the efficacy of Baptism which is given in our Catechism.

Question 69.—How is it signified and sealed unto thee in Holy Baptism, that thou hast part in the one sacrifice of Christ on the cross?

Answer.—Thus: That Christ has appointed this outward washing with water, and has joined therewith this promise, that I am washed with His blood and Spirit from the pollution of my soul, that is, from all my sins, as certainly as I am washed outwardly with water, whereby commonly the filthiness of the body is taken away.

The terms of this question are connected with question 66, where it is said "*the sacraments are signs and seals.*" The conception of sign and seal runs through all the subsequent questions and answers, though that of seal, or of a sealing transaction, predominates. It is assumed that Baptism does two things: it *signifies* grace, and it *seals* grace to the subject.

How is this done? The terms of the question imply that it is done *in* Holy Baptism. These words, "*in* Holy Baptism," are significant. They are used in connection with the present tense—thou *hast* part. The language is not, thou *mayest* have part, or thou *shalt* have part in the one sacrifice of Christ. That would imply that Baptism is only a pledge of some spiritual good which is yet future. Nor is the form of the verb *thou hast had part*. The Catechism does not use the past tense. That would imply that divine grace, communicated at some other time and in some other way, has now Baptism added or attached to it by way of certification, as the seal of the magistrate is put on a legal document to certify its validity.

The present tense is used. The construction of the language means that Holy Baptism is a present sealing transaction, or rather, that Christ seals to us in Holy Baptism the redeeming virtue of His sacrifice. The question inquires how this is, or in what sense this is to be taken.

The answer is, first, *that Christ has appointed this outward washing with water, and has joined therewith this promise.* Here the appointment is referred to Christ, as also in question 68. In question 66 it is referred to God. The English expression, *outward washing with water*, is not as strong as the original, *Wasserbad*; literally water-bath. Compare Titus

iii. 5—"Bath of regeneration." To this water-bath is joined the promise. The word *promise* is to be taken in the sense explained in a previous article.* Promise expresses not something future, but a present spiritual good. It refers to the word of God joined to the outward washing. "Therewith" relates to water-bath; not to the water, but to washing with water; not joined to the natural element, but to the transaction including the element. To this transaction is joined the word. So the Reformers expressed it, agreeably to the well-known formula of St. Augustine: "*Verbum ad elementum accedit et sacramentum fit.*" The word comes to the transaction and thereby constitutes the Sacrament. Certainly this *word* is not sound or external utterance, but denotes the contents of the word: that which the promise holds in itself is joined mystically to the water-bath.

The remaining part of the answer expounds the meaning of the foregoing general proposition. This is explicit, while the former part is implicit—"I am washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ from the pollution of my soul." Notice the term "*I.*" Not the body is washed, nor the soul, but *I* am washed. The word *I* is the deepest and most comprehensive form of expression for the mystery of personal existence. *I* am *washed* from the pollution of my soul. Pollution is correlate to washing—and is therefore explained by the subsequent clause, "from all my sins."

We will not anticipate what must be taken up in a subsequent answer, but simply say that the words, "from all my sins," mean deliverance from the twofold power of sin, or the twofold form in which the power of sin reigns over us. One form is guilt, the other is corruption or disorder. I am delivered from the penalty of my sin and from the corrupting power of sin. This deliverance is effected by the blood and Spirit of Christ. The term blood has direct reference to Christ offering Himself as a sacrifice on the cross by the shedding of His blood, or to the laying down of His life for us under the curse of the

* See *Mercersburg Review*, vol. xix., p. 553., 1872.

law, John x. 11, 18; and affirms the ground of salvation according to Question 67. The word Spirit refers to the Holy Ghost, and therefore to His regenerating work in us. These terms, *blood* and *Spirit*, express the twofold power of Baptism, remission of sins and the new birth, the negative and positive side of our salvation.

The mystical washing is as real as the water-bath. The Catechism says: "As certainly as I am washed outwardly with water, whereby commonly the filthiness of the body is taken away." The answer distinguishes these two momenta: the water-bath and the mystical washing; or the outward ablution and the inward work wrought by grace in the life of the subject. But whilst the Catechism distinguishes it does not sunder these two things. It holds the one with the other. We may say the water-bath and the mystical washing go together. They prevail in one and the same moment of time. So much at least the Catechism warrants us in affirming. But we would rather say that they are one, sacramentally; for to say that the water-bath and the mystical washing go together means rather that the two run parallel; whereas the full truth, according to the New Testament, excludes such a parallelism, and involves a union of the natural and the supernatural. This union in its sphere corresponds to the union of the two natures in Christ. If the latter, the union of God with man in the person of Christ, be called internal and organic, then the former, the union of Christ by the Spirit with the natural element in the Sacrament, may also be called internal and mystical.

The Catechism does not only hold the one in conjunction with the other, but affirms the one to be as certain as the other. The inner washing from the pollution of sin by the blood of Christ is as certain as the outer bath, whereby the filthiness of the body is washed away. Were the inner work not wrought, there would be no warrant for the outward act. Thus the certainty belonging to the knowledge which we have through our senses attaches also to the knowledge of present grace which we have through faith. Neither one can be illusion or fancy.

The motive of the Catechism in using this form of expression is to convey to believers the strongest certitude, that by Baptism they are made partakers, truly, of the full benefit of the one all-sufficient sacrifice of Jesus Christ for all their sins; so that what they come to possess by grace is adequate to all their wants as sinners, and it is not necessary to supplement the work of Christ done for them by any additional works of their own.

We have six questions on Baptism. Of these the first gives us the general conception of the Sacrament; the remaining five unfold the import of this general conception, sustain it by arguments drawn from the Scriptures, defend it against misconstruction and false inference, and affirm its relation to the children of believers.

Question 70.—What is it to be washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ?

Answer.—It is to have the forgiveness of sins from God, through grace, for the sake of Christ's blood, which He shed for us in His sacrifice on the cross; and also, to be renewed by the Holy Ghost, and sanctified to be members of Christ, that so we may more and more die unto sin, and lead holy and unblamable lives.

The question takes up the leading expression in a previous answer: *washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ*. This language expresses the deepest meaning of Baptism. It supposes that the Sacrament possesses an interior and spiritual virtue. The Catechism affirms the interior efficacy figuratively by the use of the word "washing," because the language is ruled by the baptismal conception as given in the New Testament.

The answer resolves itself into two main parts: the first ending with the words "members of Christ." What follows is the second part. The first part teaches the nature of the washing

by the blood and Spirit of Christ in relation, on the one side, to sin, and on the other, to the new life of grace. The second affirms the necessary connection between the sacramental washing and the personal history of the believer, or between Baptism and holy living, the latter being the purpose and end which the Sacrament is designed to subserve. These two main parts have each two subdivisions. We will take them up in regular order.

To be "washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ" is to have the forgiveness of sins from God through grace. Baptism seals to us the forgiveness of sins. To forgive is to remit the penalty of sin. But the penalty is not attached to sin externally by an act of the divine mind, so that the penalty might conceivably be taken away whilst the sin remains. Sin and penalty materially inhere in each other. The relation is internal. Penalty is of the nature of sin; just as felicity is of the nature of spiritual life. Sin and penalty accordingly do not simply accompany each other, much less do they follow the one upon the other. They are so essentially connected that sin is not conceivable without the present suffering of its penalty, and penalty is not conceivable without the present force of sin. There can therefore be no remission of the penalty but in as far as there is a taking away of sin itself. Hence the forgiveness of sin must include here the removal or the incipient destruction of that mysterious indwelling power which subjects us to the suffering of the penalty.

Forgiveness is predicated of God. God forgives sins; and this forgiveness from God is sealed to us by the Sacrament.

The words "through grace" pertain to the source or fountain whence forgiveness and salvation flow. Grace is the unfathomable love of God revealed in Christ, and, without any merit on our part, realized in us guilty sinners by the Holy Ghost. It is through such love of God to us that the inward cleansing from sin is freely imparted in Baptism.

Then comes the expression which is so common in the Catechism, "for the sake of Christ's blood which He shed for us in His sacrifice on the cross." It is not necessary here to enter

upon an exposition of the language. Enough to say that the Catechism holds the redeeming work of Christ, as the ground of our salvation, to be all-sufficient; and in this redeeming work His sacrifice on the cross is a central act.

The forgiveness of sins, however, is only one side of the internal efficacy of Baptism. There is another side which is equally essential. Baptism makes the sinner a new man. Did the Sacrament not possess this supernatural virtue there could be no inward cleansing or real forgiveness.

The language of the Catechism is: "And also to be renewed by the Holy Ghost and sanctified to be members of Christ." The word "renewed" may be taken pathically. Then it means a new or changed frame of sentiment, another habit of mind. "Renewed" may be taken intellectually; it then means that there is produced in us a new and better knowledge of Christ, of God, and ourselves. "Renewed" may be taken ethically. It then means that the grace of Baptism generates in us a better will, a purer moral activity. "Renewed" may also be taken to include all these forms of meaning. But the renewing grace of Baptism, viewed under either one or all of these aspects together, would be only subjective. The manifestation of our life, as it obtains in feeling, thought and will, would be regarded as changed, the essence of our life meanwhile remaining the same.

The renewing efficacy of Baptism thus taken would be equivalent to repentance or conversion. But the Catechism does not hold that Baptism converts the subject, or of itself imparts to him a new spiritual experience; for it uniformly ascribes such experience to the exercise of true faith. The word must then, evidently, have another and a deeper meaning.

The word "renewed" in this connection has a different meaning. It is to be taken as affirming a new organic relation of the subject of Baptism with Christ, the Head of His mystical body. It means that we are made partakers of His life.

That this is the meaning of the Catechism is evident from the fact that the Catechism uses the term "renewed" in connection with the expression "sanctified to be members of Christ."

The subject of Baptism is both renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. The Spirit renews him, and in renewing him, sanctifies him. The Spirit sanctifies him, but He sanctifies him in that He makes him really a new man. The new position which he occupies as renewed and sanctified by the Spirit, the Catechism expresses by the phrase: "members of Christ." The subject becomes by Baptism a member of Christ. The language is direct and positive. The Catechism does not intimate that to be members of Christ is an end to be reached by improving the grace of Baptism. The end of Baptism is brought out in the subsequent part of the answer. But it affirms that we are made members of Christ, in that we are renewed and sanctified; and this renewing and sanctifying work of the Spirit is the mystical washing of Holy Baptism.

The expression "members of Christ" must accordingly be construed, neither with *sanctified*, by itself, nor with *renewed*, but with both; for each word denotes but one aspect of the objective change wrought by the Spirit. Only when we hold both as essential and inseparable forms of one saving act in us, do we have the complete conception of the Catechism respecting the washing by the Spirit.

We may express the meaning in other words: The renewing and sanctifying of the Spirit constitutes us members of Christ. Before Baptism we were members of Adam, and subject to the curse entailed upon us by the fall. This is our position and character by nature. The Spirit takes us out of our natural position and translates us into a spiritual position. Spiritual; not in opposition to sense or understanding, but in opposition to the entire life of fallen humanity. The spiritual position is a position in Christ by the Spirit. It is new in contrast with our fallen life in Adam: and the real transition from the natural to the spiritual is a renewing, or a new birth.

The new position is holy in contrast with the sinfulness and corruption of our natural position in Adam: holy, not in a subjective but in an objective sense. We have not actualized the life of Christ perfectly in our actions, purposes, words,

thoughts, feelings, and in the hidden tendencies of our personal existence.

Holiness thus apprehended comes gradually with the progress of the Christian as he grows in Christ, and cannot become complete before the resurrection from the dead. But the position is holy in that He into whom we have been engrafted by the Spirit is holy. Engrafted into Him, He is for us and in us the principle and power of holiness, and we become actually holy in the degree that we in turn live in Him by faith and obedience. Thus the real translation from our natural state in Adam to the spiritual state in Christ includes both the renewing and the sanctifying work of the Spirit. The renewing necessarily involves the sanctifying; and the sanctifying necessarily presupposes the renewing. Without either the change of relation would not be real.

It is evident then that we are not first renewed and sanctified by the Spirit in order that by faith we may become members of Christ; but we are made members of Christ in that we are renewed and sanctified; and being members of Him we are, by virtue of this organic relation, to develop a new and holy life.

These two things, forgiveness of sins and renewing by the Holy Ghost, are, according to the Catechism, included in the mystical washing of Baptism. They express the sense which is attached to the words of the question, "washed by the blood and Spirit of Christ." This mystical washing, that is, the forgiveness through the blood of Christ, and the renewing and sanctifying by the Holy Ghost to be members of Christ, is affirmed in the previous answer, to be as real and certain as the outward washing with water.

The forgiveness of sins and the renewing by the Holy Ghost, taken together, complete the idea of the grace of Baptism. In the statement, they follow each other and must be separated, but they are not separated in idea. In idea they are one. We are not first forgiven and then renewed by the Holy Ghost, neither are we not first renewed by the Holy Ghost and then forgiven. But the forgiveness and the renewing are two aspects of one divine act.

According to the Catechism, the twofold grace of the Spirit, as now explained, is *sealed* to us in Holy Baptism. The word sealed is to be taken in the Scripture sense, as in John vi. 27 : "For Him hath God the Father sealed." Compare Eph. i. 13, and iv. 30. To seal, according to the New Testament, is not merely to impress on something already existing—an external sign of confirmation or ratification—but it is to constitute the relation of a person to God by the Spirit in a real way. God the Father sealed His Son at His baptism, when the heavens opened and the Spirit descended upon Him like a dove. The outward and sensible was only the manifestation of the inward and spiritual communication. The New Testament uses the word seal in no other sense.

According to the Scripture import of a sealing transaction, the Catechism asserts, as we have before seen, that the real communication of grace is as certain as the outward washing. That this may be so, the two things, the inward and the outward, must be simultaneous. When Holy Baptism is administered, then the Grace of the Blood and Spirit of Christ is communicated.

If this interpretation is not allowed to stand, then one of two alternatives must follow. The grace of Baptism must have been communicated at some time previous to the administration of the Sacrament. Going on this assumption, the grace of Baptism would not be certain; for forgiveness and the renewing by the Spirit would then depend, not on God, but on the subject. It would depend on repentance and faith; and if the repentance and faith were not genuine, the grace would not be conferred. Baptism would be a doubtful instead of a sealing ordinance.

Hence what the Catechism insists on so strenuously would fall to the ground. The grace on this assumption cannot be as certain as the baptismal act.

Let us assume the other alternative. The grace of Baptism is received *after* the baptismal act. The baptismal act is then no more than an outward pledge; and as in the previous case, the actual receiving of grace must depend on repentance and

faith. If the subject, as is often the case, does not repent and believe, the grace sealed in Baptism is of no avail in any sense. The grace depends on a contingency, on something that may or may not take place, and most truly cannot be as certain as the baptismal act.

If, therefore, we are to accept the language of the Catechism in its full meaning, the least we must hold is that the grace is simultaneous with the baptismal transaction. Thus only can the inward be as certain as the outward. The language of the Catechism is explicit and unconditional. It does not say we are certainly washed with the blood and Spirit of Christ, if we repent and believe. Nothing of this kind appears in answer 69 or 70, or in the remaining answers on Baptism.

We pass on to the second main part of the answer, which expresses the end whereunto we are baptized, "that so we may more and more die unto sin and lead holy and unblamable lives." This part, like the first, has two elements; the one negative, the other positive.

The negative side is "that we may more and more die unto sin," corresponding to "forgiveness of sins from God for the sake of Christ's blood" as expressed in the first main part of the answer. The positive side is, that we "may lead holy and unblamable lives," corresponding to renewing and sanctifying by the Holy Ghost.

As our sins are forgiven, we are to die unto sin, "ye langer, ye mehr." We, as related to sin, die. Death is predicated of us, not of sin. We cease more and more to live under the power of sin, as our personal life is determined more and more by grace; and, in turn, sin itself becomes relatively a weaker force. In other words, the old man, as St. Paul names the fallen nature, is in process of destruction; on the other hand, the new man, as St. Paul calls the spiritual nature, is in process of development and growth; we lead a holy life. The holy life we lead is the fruit of regeneration, or of our engrafting into Christ by the Spirit, and involves repentance, faith and personal consecration to Christ.

These two, the dying of the old man and the continued vivi-

fication of the new man, are only different aspects of one mysterious process. They reciprocally condition each other. But the dying depends on the living. To live in Christ is the power in virtue of which we die unto sin. But the negative side of the process must go forward commensurably with its positive side. If not, the positive process is itself checked, if not suspended.

Holy Baptism is accordingly the beginning of a real salvation. We are forgiven, but this does not supersede the necessity of subsequent forgiveness. We are renewed and sanctified, but this does not supersede the necessity of free activity in the service of Christ. We may say properly that in Baptism we are saved. So St. Peter, "The like figure whereunto Baptism doth also now save us." (1 Peter, iii. 21.) But it is a salvation which looks toward a higher salvation and a completion in time to come.

As the subject of the second part of this answer is taken up in Ques. 88, 89 and 90, under the head of Repentance or Conversion, it is not necessary here to consider at length the doctrine of the Catechism. We will, however, emphasize one characteristic feature of the doctrine.

The conception of the *blood and Spirit of Christ* is of fundamental force. On the negative side, these three are connected together, viz.: Blood of Christ, forgiveness of sins from God, and dying unto sin, each one presupposing and depending on the other two, so that neither one can be understood in the sense of the Catechism unless it be viewed in relation to the others. As the sacrifice of Christ is in order to forgiveness, so is forgiveness in order to dying unto sin. If we receive no forgiveness, the sacrifice does not avail for our benefit, and if we do not die unto sin, the forgiveness received does not accomplish its purpose in our personal history. The relation of these three is to be viewed also under another aspect. No man can die unto sin unless he receives the grace of forgiveness from God; and there is no forgiveness possible unless it is grounded in the one all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ.

On the positive side there are also three connected together in a corresponding manner. These three are: The Spirit of Christ, renewing by His Spirit, and leading a holy life. The gift of Christ's Spirit is in order to our renewing by the Spirit, and our renewing by the Spirit is in order to a holy and unblamable life. Were the Spirit of Christ not given, and did He not abide in the Church, there could be no renewing by the Spirit; and were we not renewed and sanctified by the Spirit to be members of Christ, there could be no holy living. The third fact depends on the second, and the second on the first. No man can therefore lead a holy life unless he is a member of Christ; and no man can become a member of Christ except by the Spirit, who proceeds from Christ ascended and glorified.

The Catechism gives no countenance to the notion that any one can lead a life acceptable to God, who is not regenerated by the Holy Ghost. Nor does it countenance that other notion, which prevails among so many sects of the present day, that men are regenerated by the Spirit of *God*, that is, by the Spirit given at will by God directly from heaven. The Spirit that regenerates is the Spirit given by *Christ* glorified, now abiding and active in the communion and sacraments of the Church.

But there is another fact that requires special attention. The Catechism does not divide the Spirit from the blood of Christ, nor the blood from the Spirit of Christ. They are only two forms of one redeeming work. The virtue of the sacrifice becomes complete in the glorification of Christ, and the glorification of Christ in the coming of His Spirit. Were there no sacrifice possessing perpetual virtue in the communion of the Church, there would be no renewing of men by the Spirit, and in consequence no holy living. And were there no presence of the Spirit in undiminished fulness, there could be no forgiveness for the sake of Christ's blood, and no dying unto sin.

The Catechism affirms both sides of the truth, forgiveness and a new life, with equal distinctness and consistency; and affirms both in their connection with the Sacrament of Holy Baptism.

Question 71.—Where has Christ promised, that we are as certainly washed with His blood and Spirit, as with the water of Baptism ?

Answer.—In the institution of Baptism, which runs thus : “Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved ; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.”

This promise is also repeated where the Scripture calls Baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins.

The strong and explicit utterances respecting the efficacy of Baptism, as given in the previous answer, now lead the Catechism to inquire what warrant of authority there is in the word of Christ for such teaching. “Where has Christ promised ?” is the question. We are referred directly not to the Old but to the New Testament ; nor in a general way to the New Testament, but to what Christ Himself has taught. Christ has promised—what ? He has promised two things : that we are washed by His blood and Spirit, and that we are as *certainly* washed by His blood and Spirit as we are with the water of Baptism. The aim of the Catechism is to maintain from the word of Christ that the inward washing, *i. e.*, the forgiveness of sins and the renewing by the Holy Ghost, is as real and certain as the outward washing.

The main part of the answer is drawn from the commission given by our Lord to His apostles, as recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark : Matt. xxviii. 19, 20 ; Mark xvi. 15, 16. This is followed by two quotations from St. Paul—Titus iii. 5, and Acts xxii. 16.

From St. Matthew we have the words of institution : “Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ;” the latter part of the commission being omitted. From the com-

mission as recorded by St. Mark we have: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Here the first part is omitted.

Then follows the repetition of the promise as expressed by St. Paul: in the words "*washing of regeneration.*" The entire passage runs thus: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy, He saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." From this passage the Catechism selects the most expressive clause—washing of regeneration; or, as the original may be translated, and as the German version has it, *bath of new birth*. "Das Bad der Wiedergeburt" is the descriptive title which St. Paul gives to Baptism; which is nearly equivalent to the phrase, sacrament of regeneration.

The equivalent expression, "*the washing away of sins,*" is taken from the address of St. Paul to the people in Jerusalem, in which he rehearses the history of his conversion to Christ. Ananias came unto him and said: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

The Catechism does not comment on the words of institution. They are so direct and unequivocal that they are cited without comment to support the idea of the nature and efficacy of Baptism, as taught in the preceding two questions. But the purpose for which the words of institution are quoted shows unmistakably in what sense they are taken; for they are quoted from the institution of Baptism to prove that our Lord has joined to the water-bath the forgiveness of sins, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; or, that Holy Baptism is an outward washing with water, and an inward washing by the blood and Spirit of Christ, at one and the same time. The meaning is seen in the words themselves; and is evident also from a consideration of the connection in which the words are made to stand by the Catechism.

The meaning appears, moreover, from the language which follows the words of institution. The Catechism says, "This promise is also repeated." The words of Christ are sufficient

by themselves. The Catechism, of course, does not imply that they need any support or confirmation from St. Paul. But the design is to evince the harmony of apostolic teaching with that of Christ. Hence the writings of the Apostles are said to repeat what the words of institution teach. They repeat the same truth in other and equivalent forms of expression.

This answer confirms what we have said before in regard to the use of the word *promise*. In telling us what the promise is, and where it is to be found, the Catechism cites directly the institution of Baptism itself; and, in immediate connection therewith, the positive and unequivocal teaching of St. Paul. Hence by *promise* the Catechism cannot mean the grace of Christ disjoined from, and following after, Baptism; it cannot designate, merely, something that depends on what men may do, or may not do. Thus interpreted, the expression would contradict the central truth concerning Baptism, on which the entire argument of the Catechism hinges. But by *promise* the Catechism means the *word* of Christ indissolubly joined to the natural element. In virtue of this mystical conjunction of His word with the outward washing, the transaction becomes the bath of the new birth, or the washing away of sins.

Question 72.—Is then the outward washing with water itself the washing away of sins?

Answer.—No: for only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit cleanse us from all sin.

The terms of the question are significant. The Catechism does not ask whether Baptism is itself the washing away of sins. This form of inquiry is studiously avoided; for *Baptism and external washing* with water (Wasserbad), are by no means equivalent expressions. In the Sacrament the Catechism recognizes two things as essential: the external water-bath and the internal grace. It inquires whether the outward washing, viewed by itself, possesses spiritual virtue; whether

the application of the natural element can take away sin, implying that the internal and external washing may be confounded. The interior substance of Baptism may be ignored, and the supernatural virtue of the Sacrament ascribed exclusively to the external washing.

The occasion of the question is a supposed objection to the explicit teaching of the previous questions. The objector alleges: if, as you teach, the renewing and sanctifying by the Spirit, as well as the forgiveness of sins, are just as certain as the outward washing, then you ascribe spiritual efficacy to an external ablution. The answer is, "No!" We ascribe no spiritual efficacy to the external washing itself. "For only the blood of Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit cleanse us from all sin."

The objection in this form may come from the spiritualistic tendency which was ripe in the Reformation period. Many had no faith whatever in the objective virtue of the Sacraments.

The question, however, may also refer to another objection. The strong teaching of the Catechism exposed it, in the judgment of many, to the charge of teaching the Roman error, viz.: the so-called *opus operatum* theory. Then the objection would be—if the grace of the Spirit is just as certain as the water-bath, you supersede the necessity of repentance and faith, or of inward spiritual religion, and Baptism itself does the whole work irrespectively of the interior spiritual state and activity of the subject. To such a misapprehension and perversion of the doctrine of the Catechism, the answer likewise says "No." It negates two opposite errors; the one making Holy Baptism an empty sign, the other ascribing to it a force *ex opere operato*.

In the answer we meet the same language which we find in Answer 69, the favorite and most comprehensive language of the Catechism. The Catechism does not by any means hold the external water-bath to be a matter of indifference, but, when taken by itself, refuses to ascribe to it renewing and sanctifying efficacy, and ascribes such supernatural virtue solely and exclusively to the Blood and Spirit of Christ.

Nor does the Catechism mean to ascribe such efficacy to the blood and Spirit of Christ, as such, or abstractly considered. It does not imply that the sinner may receive saving grace and be made a member of Christ by the Spirit, with or without Baptism, as though Baptism were a matter of indifference; but it insists only on this: that when we emphasize the distinction between the visible sign and the invisible grace, the spiritual virtue of the Sacrament must be predicated of the invisible grace, not of the natural element. •

Question 73.—Why, then, doth the Holy Ghost call Baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins?

Answer.—God speaks thus not without great cause; namely, not only to teach us thereby that, like as the filthiness of the body, is taken away by water, so our sins also are taken away by the blood and Spirit of Christ; but much more, that by this divine pledge and token, He may assure us that we are as really washed from our sins spiritually, as our bodies are washed with water.

In the question the word *then* is emphatic. It refers to the doctrine of Baptism as presented in the entire preceding argument, but more particularly to question 72, which at first view seems to deny what was before so positively affirmed. If the outward washing, a transaction essential to the Sacrament, can not take away sins, why call the Sacrament the washing of regeneration? Are not the two things incompatible? The argument has apparently been involved in a dilemma. The contradiction must be removed.

But the seeming contradiction is not in the argument. It prevails rather in the misapprehension of the argument which underlies the alleged objection taken up in question 72. Observe that the objection adroitly changes the terms of the doctrine.

In the first three questions the Catechism speaks of the nature of Holy Baptism, which includes the washing with water and the washing with the blood and Spirit of Christ, both being essential constituents of the Sacrament. Question 72 changes the subject of inquiry. Instead of asking whether Baptism is indeed the washing away of sins, it asks whether the *outward washing*, an act of which, when taken by itself, the Catechism has predicated neither forgiveness nor regeneration, is such washing away of sins. It is to this one-sided and false conception of Baptism that the Catechism replies categorically in the negative. No such outward washing is of any avail; not because *Baptism* is inefficacious, but because the outward washing with water is *not* Baptism.

In question 73 we are led back to the consideration of the subject proper; not to the contemplation of the external water-bath, but to that of Holy Baptism itself. "Why then doth the Holy Ghost call *Baptism* the washing of regeneration?" If such language is so liable to misapprehension; if we are in danger of ascribing a virtue to water that can be predicated only of the blood and Spirit of Christ, why speak of the *washing* of regeneration?

The answer proceeds to justify both the general doctrine and the language by which the doctrine is expressed. "God speaks thus not without great cause." There is a sufficient reason for the affirmation that Baptism is the washing of regeneration. What is it?

The reason is twofold; and the answer, in consequence, resolves itself into two members, the one being the protasis, and the other the apodosis at one general proposition. The protasis, or first member of the proposition, is negative, but involves a direct affirmation. The apodosis, or second member, is affirmative, but involves a direct negation of the previous implied affirmation as containing the whole idea of the Sacrament. Let us consider the two members in proper order.

The first member denies. What does it deny? The Holy Ghost calls Baptism the washing of regeneration, "not only to teach us thereby that like as the filthiness of the body is

taken away by water, so our sins also are taken away by the blood and Spirit of Christ." This language involves the affirmation that there is an analogy between the washing of the body with water, which removes outward filthiness, and the inward washing by the blood and Spirit of Christ, which removes the pollution of our sins. The outward and natural is a figure or sign of the inward and spiritual; and thus aids us in apprehending the meaning and force of Baptism. We see the communication and efficacy of grace in the application and cleansing of water. The language of the answer implies also that Baptism is called the washing of regeneration for the purpose of *teaching* us that there is this analogy between the outward washing with water and the inward washing by the Spirit. Water is a symbol, and Baptism involves a symbolical transaction. The words "*not only* to teach us thereby," followed in the second member by the adversative formula: "but much more," clearly involves the idea that the Sacrament has symbolical significance. God teaches us by the Sacrament that our sins are taken away just as the filthiness of the body is taken away.

But the implicit affirmation is involved in a categorical negation. The negation is the prominent and ruling thought. Whilst the protasis means to imply that there is undoubtedly such an analogy between the application of water and the purification by the Spirit, the leading purpose is to *deny* that when the Holy Ghost calls Baptism the washing of regeneration, He teaches us this *only*, and no more. It is denied that Baptism is merely a symbol; or that the conception of an analogy between water and the Spirit takes up the true nature of the Sacrament. The denial proceeds on the assumption that the Sacrament is much more than a teaching symbol. It possesses a character, an interior power, which transcends the simple conception of an analogy between outward washing and inward purification; and thus postulates the necessity of progress in the argument; in other words, the necessity of the direct affirmation which follows in the second member of the answer.

The Catechism accordingly sets aside the view of all those

who accord to Baptism the force of a symbol only, and maintain that the Sacrament does no more than teach, by means of an impressive ceremony, that our sins are removed by divine grace. Did the Catechism design to affirm this truth, and nothing more, the affirmation involved in the protasis would itself express it, and there would be no occasion on the one hand to deny that the implicit affirmation exhausts the idea of Baptism, and on the other to pass on and assert positively that the idea includes "much more."

Let us now consider the second member of the answer. As stated before, the apodosis contains a direct affirmation, which involves a relative denial of the truth affirmed by implication in the protasis. The adversative formula, "but much more," plainly implies that whilst Baptism, as being the washing of regeneration, is a symbolical transaction, yet the conception of a symbol does not comprehend the peculiar nature of the Sacrament in distinction from teaching by word or symbol. The Sacrament is far more than either one or both. It does *not only* teach us, but it does much more than teach or symbolize. What is the *much more*? What is the reason that the Holy Ghost calls Baptism the washing of regeneration? What is the true and positive reason?

The *much more*, as the answer has it, is "that by this divine pledge and token He may assure us, that we are as really washed from our sins spiritually, as our bodies are washed with water." The force of the positive assertion turns on the word *assure*, and is used antithetically to the word *teach* in the protasis. God does not only teach us; but much more than this, by calling Baptism the washing of regeneration, He also assures. The original is *willversichern*. God designs to remove all doubt or fear, and cause us to believe certainly and firmly that the invisible grace which the sacramental transaction symbolizes is not absent or wanting, but is a present fact. The answer, however, does not get beyond the conception of assurance. The visible and the invisible, the outward and the inward, are put and held in juxtaposition; and the reality of the one certifies the presence of the other; but the two things,

the supernatural and the natural, are not so related as to constitute one mystery.

Of what does God assure us? That we are really washed from our sins spiritually. The argument is approaching a climax; at least it aims at this. The answer to question 69 says that "I am washed from all my sins as *certainly* as I am washed with water." The German is, *so gewiss*. Question 71 continues the same formula: "Where has Christ promised that we are as certainly (*so gewiss*) washed?" But here the Catechism relinquishes this formula, and adopts another. It rises from the conception of *gewissheit* (certainty) to that of *wahrhaftigkeit* (reality). The spiritual washing is not merely *certain* but *real*, not *gewiss*, but *wahrhaftig*. The German *wahrhaftig* is much stronger than the English word really or truly. It means not only that the spiritual washing is a present transaction, but that it is as true and actual as the bodily washing. We are as really washed from our sins spiritually, that is, by the blood and Spirit of Christ, as our bodies are washed with water.

The English language does not allow a literal rendering of the German; and thus weakens somewhat the force of the argument. The English, in giving the analogy or parallel between the spiritual washing and the bodily washing, changes the subject. It says, "*We* are as really washed from our sins as *our bodies* are washed." But the German has the same subject in both relations. *We* are washed from our sins, and *we* are washed with water. As we are the subjects of a bodily washing, so really are we at the same time the subjects of a spiritual washing. Both are equally a present fact.

How does God assure us that we are really washed spiritually? He does it "by this divine pledge and token." A *pledge* is something that stands good for that which it represents. The two, the pledge and the thing pledged, stand together, and fall together. The one cannot prevail without the other. The relation is in this sense unconditional; but not internal and vital.

A *token* is of the nature of sign; but a stronger term; yet

token is not as strong a term as the German *wahrzeichen*, truth sign; that is, a visible object that is so connected with the invisible truth which it exhibits, that the former becomes the positive guaranty of the latter.

Pledge and token are conjoined. They do not express different conceptions, but two aspects of one common conception. They are conjoined in order to affirm the present grace of Baptism with more clearness and force; or, expressing the same thing in other words, Baptism symbolizes grace and makes certain to the subject the presence and virtue of grace.

The pledge and token are divine. The adjective qualifies both. The pledge is divine: the token is divine. Or rather that one act, designated as a pledge and token, is divine. Divine, first, because the washing with water in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost is instituted by Christ; and second, because there is connected with the outward washing a divine act. Holy Baptism is a divine transaction. The pledge and token given by God must be true. His word being joined to the outward washing, and God being true to His word, we have a transaction wherein the spiritual washing cannot but be as certain and real as the bodily washing.

Question 74.—Are infants also to be baptized?

Answer.—Yes. For since they, as well as their parents, belong to the covenant and people of God, and both redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost, who works faith, are through the blood of Christ promised to them, no less than to their parents, they are also by Baptism, as a sign of the covenant, to be ingrafted into the Christian Church, and distinguished from the children of unbelievers, as was done in the Old Testament by circumcision, in the place of which in the New Testament Baptism is appointed.

To this question the Catechism replies unequivocally "Yes." Although infants for want of adequate maturity of life are in-

capable of repentance for sin and faith in Christ, yet they are to be baptized. The grace of Baptism may not be denied to them. This unequivocal answer affirms the catholic position of the Reformed Church relative to infant baptism; and in one view of the case it is entirely sufficient. But for the reason already given the answer proceeds to state more fully the sense in which the positive affirmation is made and the ground on which it rests. We have, therefore, in what follows, two leading thoughts. The one pertains to the nature and force of infant baptism, the other to the argument by which the practice of the Church is sustained and defended against the attacks of all classes of anti-pedobaptists.

The main thought comes out in the middle portion of the answer—"They are also by Baptism to be engrafted into the Christian Church;" and the force of the thought turns on the word *engrafted*. The original is *einverleibt*, literally *incorporated*; that is, made a member of the mystical body. But the Anglo-saxon term *engraft* suits the context better. By Baptism there is established a new life relation of the infant with Christ in His Church. So St. Paul: "Therefore we are buried with Him by Baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection." (Rom. vi. 4, 5.)

The figure of engrafting is borrowed from the language of St. Paul, and is derived from a natural act. (Romans xi. 17-23.) A twig cut off from one tree is set into the body of another tree, and the two by a reciprocal life-action become one constitution. The twig grows as a member of the organism of the tree. It grows by virtue of the internal plastic power of the living, growing tree; but not by this plastic power exclusively. The living twig reacts upon the life of the tree, taking that life up into itself, and transfusing through itself all the mysterious energies of the tree. Then the twig grows as the tree grows. The tree grows in the twig, and the twig in the tree.

In the light of this rich analogy the Catechism affirms the nature and objective force of infant baptism. The infant is engrafted, or made a member of Christ's mystical body. It is translated from the kingdom and power of the devil into the kingdom and power of Christ, and then stands in the supernatural communion of Christ, where it possesses all the spiritual resources that are requisite to growth in grace. If it is rightly trained by the parents; and if, as it develops into consciousness and freedom, it does not renounce its spiritual inheritance, but avails itself of the resources of grace which it possesses, the new life relation will issue in complete salvation and eternal blessedness.

The Catechism says that the infant is engrafted *by Baptism*. Baptism on the one hand is the sacrament that breaks the power of the fall and the curse, or the power of the old natural relation in which the child stands by natural birth. On the other, it is the Sacrament that constitutes the new relation of life and salvation on the spirit, or that makes the child a partaker of the infinite fullness of Christ.

The engrafting is effected by Baptism "as a sign of the covenant." The covenant is the real economy or household of grace, or the supernatural communion on earth, created, ruled, and perpetuated by the Holy Spirit of Christ given on the day of Pentecost. Baptism, the washing of regeneration, being both an outward and an inward act, is a sign and seal of the supernatural communion, symbolizing the positive efficacy of the grace conferred, this grace by which the unconscious subject is adopted into the family of God. (Ques. 65.)

The argument by which the baptismal engrafting of infant children into the Christian Church is supported and defended is twofold. The one is, that the children of the faithful "belong to the covenant and people of God;" the other, that "both redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost, who works faith, are through the blood of Christ promised to them."

Infants belong to the covenant and people of God; the one term, covenant, designating the new objective order of life, in the bosom of which alone the salvation of Christ prevails, and

is accessible to sinners, whether adults or infants ; the other, people of God, designating the community of individual members, of which the covenant or supernatural economy is composed. Infants belong to both. The word belong, *gehören*, may, however, not be pressed, or there would be a contradiction between the antecedent assigning the reason and necessity of Baptism, and the consequent affirming the force and benefit thereof.

Belong does not mean that infants as such are in the proper sense members of the covenant. Were this the case, then grace would be communicated according to the law of natural generation. Natural birth from Christian parents would, *ipso facto*, constitute the child a member of the supernatural economy. The idea involves a confusion of the order of nature and the order of grace, or of the natural and the spiritual. According to the law of nature the fallen life of mankind reproduces and perpetuates itself in the image of the first man. That which is born of the flesh is flesh. Only that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. (John iii. 6.) If we assume that the Spirit of Christ works in and with the law of natural generation, then we are afloat upon the pantheistic current of thought, and surrender the broad, clearly defined scriptural distinction between the economy of nature and the economy of the Spirit.

But the term *belong* is to be understood in the sense of right or title. The natural relation of an infant to its believing, Christian parents, secures for it the right to a spiritual relation, or the right to a participation in the spiritual blessings which its parents, as the people of God, possess. The relation implies, on the part of the parents, obligation, and on the part of the child, a positive claim or title. The parents are bound to consecrate their child by Baptism to Christ, and thus bring it into the spiritual communion of the Church ; and the infant, just as it has rights before the civil law, though unconscious, has a silent claim also, equally real and positive, though unable to assert the right itself, before the spiritual law, or at the altar of God, which the parents and the minister of Christ can as

little disregard or violate as they can the positive right of the infant to food and clothing. It has spiritual and churchly rights as really as it possesses natural or bodily rights.

The fact that the child of believing parents possesses such spiritual rights according to the law of the Christian faith is the first reason assigned by the Catechism for the Baptism of infants. The reason rests on an organic view of the human race. As in the natural order the child is bound up necessarily with the parents, so that it shares their blood, nationality, language, civil position and honors, the blessings of their morality and social culture, as well as the miseries of their vice and degradation, so also is it bound up with them in the spiritual order.

Through the divinely appointed means of grace not the isolated individual only, but the family, is to be made a sharer in full of the gifts of the Spirit. To maintain that the infant is excluded, because unable to repent and believe, involves a contradiction. It is on the one hand to affirm that Christianity is adapted to the nature and all the wants of the human race, and on the other, to set aside and contravene the deepest law that informs and governs the organization of human society.

The other reason assigned for the baptism of infants is still stronger and more direct. It grows immediately out of the nature and design of the Christian salvation. "Redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost are promised to them." The Catechism recognizes in the infant the presence and power of sin, according to questions 7 and 8. Being organically one with the fallen race, it is under the curse from the moment of conception. "Conceived and born in sin," it is helplessly and hopelessly subject to corruption and death. Hence for the infant, redemption or actual deliverance from the kingdom of darkness, is as necessary as for the parents: and the redemption of Christ, being designed for mankind, not for single individuals, this redemption is promised to every rank and class of mankind; infants being as really comprehended as adults. The promise is indeed expressed in the written word, but it has a deeper ground. It lies in the very idea of the salvation of

Christ. The written word only utters and records the comprehensive truth which the salvation, as holding in the person and work of Christ, embraces.

The language of the Catechism, "redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost," is not here to be taken objectively. It does not mean merely, as some Calvinists maintain, that the value of the atonement is infinite, and therefore is in itself sufficient for all men, or that the merit of Christ's active and passive obedience is sufficient to cover the demerit of all possible sins; whilst the design and availability of the infinite merit of Christ does not, with equal certainty, relate to every individual member of the race. That the Catechism really holds the infinite value of Christ's redeeming work, and that no one will perish for want of an adequate salvation, objectively considered, is undoubted. But this view of redemption is not, taken by itself, the reason which the Catechism assigns for the baptism of infants.

The language is to be taken rather in a subjective sense. It means that the infinite value of the salvation wrought out by Christ is really a salvation for the infant no less than for its parents. The infant is to be made positively a partaker of redemption and the Holy Ghost. Grace is *promised* to it. It is the subject for whom Christ died and rose again, and to whom the Holy Ghost is to be given; the infant, though incapable of any free activity, being yet capable of receiving the Spirit, and of sharing the benefits of redemption, which the Spirit applies. Accordingly, in the sermon of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, the first evangelical sermon preached in the power of the Spirit, the relation of the completed salvation to the children of believers is unequivocally proclaimed. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts ii. 38, 39.)

The baptismal gift of the Spirit works faith in the heart of the baptized child. Apprehended by the Spirit in Baptism,

and adopted into the communion of the Spirit, the infant is subject to the transforming and moulding power of the Spirit, who so works in the germinal beginnings of awakening personal existence, that the child is constrained to believe and rejoice in Jesus Christ, so soon as, developing gradually into consciousness, it gets a sense and a perception of Him.

The promise of redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost is referred "to the blood of Christ," or to the offering of Himself on the cross, which Christ, now glorified at the right hand of God, made when in the flesh. "He bore, in body and soul, the wrath of God against the sin of the whole human race, in order that by His passion, as the only atoning sacrifice, He might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and obtain for us the grace of God, righteousness and eternal life." (Ques. 37.) The guilt for which He thus atoned is not merely the guilt which the race incurs by actual transgression. He atones for the universal guilt attaching to the race in consequence of the fall. "He is our mediator, and with His innocence and perfect holiness covers, in the sight of God, my sin wherein I was conceived." (Ques. 36.) The blood of Christ, being shed as truly for inborn sin as for actual transgression, whereby inborn sin is covered before God as certainly as actual sin is pardoned, the promise realized by the child in Baptism is, according to the Catechism, the direct and necessary effect of redemption as really as the personal justification of the adult sinner through faith.

The Catechism does not hold the doctrine of a limited atonement, as taught by the Decrees of the Synod of Dort and the Confession of the Westminster Assembly. Christ is the Saviour of mankind, not of some elect individuals only. As He has assumed the nature of Adam, which all men possess, so He has atoned for the sin of Adam, in which all men, by the common possession of a fallen nature, are involved. Such being the extent of the atonement affirmed by the Catechism, it can give no countenance to the notion of a supralapsarian decree, according to which some infants are from all eternity elected unto life eternal, agreeably to the sovereign pleasure

of Almighty God, whilst others are passed by, being given over absolutely as vessels of wrath to the power of the devil. For non-elect infants there is no Saviour, no atonement, no saving-work of the Holy Ghost, and therefore no grace in holy baptism. They are lost irrecoverably, whether baptized or not baptized. Redemption not being promised to them, the sacrament of Baptism cannot make them partakers of redemption. Baptism can avail only for the spiritual benefit of the elect. Of such limitations of sacramental grace by the divine counsel, the Catechism knows nothing. It does not discriminate. All baptized infants are the subject of the promise; and all are thereby, in virtue of the redeeming work of Christ, made partakers of the Holy Spirit, who works faith in their hearts, so that, believing in Christ and abiding in faith, they may, one and all, be eternally saved.

Observe that the Catechism continues the distinction between the *blood* and *Spirit* of Christ which runs through the previous questions and answers on Holy Baptism; intending to teach thereby that the full benefit of Christ, the negative and positive efficacy of His work, on the forgiveness of sins and the mystical union with Christ, is for infants no less than for adults. For this reason we have the clear, positive affirmation that infants are by Baptism *engrafted* into the Christian Church.

Thus engrafted, the children of believing parents are "distinguished from the children of unbelievers." The distinction is inward and real as well as outward and nominal. The children of unbelievers do not as such possess the blessings of the Faith. They are not only not in the covenant; they do not only not possess the grace which prevails in the communion of the Church; but they do not, like the children of believers, "belong to the covenant and people of God;" that is, they do not, in virtue of their natural relation to their parents, possess any right or title to an engrafting by Baptism into the Christian Church. They stand in the old stock as in the wild olive tree; and as such being members exclusively of fallen humanity are, like their parents, the children of wrath. But the broad distinction made between these two classes of infant children

does not contradict the objective character and design of the Gospel, which, considered in itself, is adapted to the needs of all alike and designed for all. The distinction only emphasizes the positive spiritual advantages of the children of the Church over the children of the world, and by necessary implication condemns as sinful the indifference of parents to the means of grace. How fearful is the responsibility of those who through their unbelief not only close the door of hope against themselves, but, so far as their unbelief and negligence work their effect in the spiritual history of their families and of their posterity, also shut them out from the kingdom of heaven.

These, then, are the principal reasons of the Catechism for the baptism of infants. The children of believers are entitled to the blessings of the covenant, and the grace of the Gospel is promised to them in distinction from the children of unbelievers. They are therefore by Baptism to be constituted members of the mystical body of Christ.

In conclusion, the answer proceeds to draw a parallel between the Old and New Testament, between circumcision and the sacrament of Baptism, between the children of Jewish and the children of Christian parents; a parallel that serves both to illustrate and to support infant Baptism by a subordinate argument. The Mosaic economy foreshadows the Christian economy. Whilst it was limited to the Jewish nation it nevertheless comprehended every member of the Jewish family, being intended for the helpless infant as well as for the full-grown man. The Christian economy is not less comprehensive. Designed not for a single nation, but for all the nations of the earth, it as a matter of course includes the child. The substance does not contradict the shadow. The fulfillment of the promise in Christ cannot contravene the economy of the promise. Otherwise the Christian Church would not be the fulfillment of Judaism, but a contradiction.

Rights and duties under the Christian economy are analogous to rights and duties under the Jewish economy. What was then the duty of Jewish parents is now the duty of Chris-

tian parents. What were then the rights of Jewish children, are now the rights of Christian children. As the neglect of circumcision held the child in the state of nature and excluded it from the blessing of God bestowed in and through the Jewish communion, so does the neglect of Baptism keep the child in its original natural state, subject to the powers of the Kingdom of Darkness, and exclude it from a positive participation in the Grace of the Gospel, which is accessible nowhere but in the communion of the Christian Church.

CONCLUSION.

The results of our examination of these six questions and answers we gather up in the following propositions, which express in summary form a correct view, as we believe, of the doctrine of Holy Baptism as taught in the Heidelberg Catechism.

1. Holy Baptism is an ordinance wherein by the appointment of Christ the outward washing with water and the inward washing with the blood and Spirit of Christ are conjoined in one transaction, and so conjoined that the inward washing is always as certain and real as the outward washing.

2. The spiritual benefit conferred by Baptism upon the person baptized is the washing with the blood and Spirit of Christ. This grace is accordingly twofold, namely, the forgiveness of sins for the sake of the one sacrifice of Christ offered for us on the cross, and renewal by the Holy Ghost; or remission of sin and the new birth.

Thus through Baptism they who worthily receive this Sacrament are separated from the unbelieving world, renewed and sanctified to be members of Christ, and engrafted into His mystical body. These several forms of spiritual blessing however, separation, forgiveness, renewal and engrafting are not divine gifts which are conferred one after another, but they are different aspects only of one act of the free grace of God.

3. The spiritual efficacy of Baptism is objective; being neither in the officiating minister nor in the person baptized, but in the ordinance itself duly administered and received. No

personal unfitness of the subject, nor moral unworthiness, can affect the nature of the Sacrament, or detract from the reality and virtue of the baptismal transaction.

4. But when the Catechism distinguishes between the external washing with water and the internal washing with the Holy Spirit, the spiritual efficacy of Baptism is ascribed, not to the external washing itself, for the external washing considered by itself is not the sacramental transaction, but to the blood and Spirit of Christ. Spiritual efficacy, however, is not ascribed to the blood and Spirit of Christ as such, or as abstracted from the external washing with water, but to His blood and Spirit as sacramentally connected with the external washing with water in the baptismal transaction.

5. The spiritual efficacy of Baptism is not tied to the moment of administration.

This proposition does not mean that the baptismal transaction may be an empty or purely external washing, the internal washing with the blood and Spirit of Christ being not sacramentally connected therewith.

But the proposition means that the cleansing and renewing efficacy of Baptism is not limited by the moment of time when the Sacrament is administered.

The grace conferred at the time of administration is efficacious retrospectively and prospectively; being effectual for the taking away of the sins of the subject that have been committed in time past or that may be committed in time to come.

6. The grace conferred by Baptism is efficacious retrospectively. The person baptized being through the medium of the Sacrament introduced into the covenant and engrafted into Christ, and thus joined to Him in His death and resurrection, receives the forgiveness of inborn and actual sins. The dominion of the kingdom of darkness is broken, and the guilt of his transgressions is taken away. He passes from the sphere of the curse and of death into the sphere of grace and of life.

7. The grace conferred by Baptism is efficacious prospectively. The efficacy of the Sacrament extends to sins that may be committed after it has been administered; and this efficacy

is as certain and complete in its relation to the future as it is in its relation to the present and the past.

As natural birth has force and effect for the whole period of natural life even unto death, the filial relation never being annihilated, so has the new birth, or the washing of regeneration, full force and effect for the entire subsequent, ethical and religious history of the subject, the virtue of the new spiritual relation being at no time absolutely abolished. The penitent prodigal, be he never so guilty, may ever recur by faith to the real relation wherein he stands as a child of God by adoption in Christ; that is to say, he may recur to his Baptism as the seal of God's saving grace, and the pledge of forgiveness which, for the infinite merits of Christ, God is willing freely to grant.

8. Although efficacious as the seal of forgiveness and of the new life both retrospectively and prospectively, yet Baptism does not save the subject *ex opere operato*. The blood and Spirit of Christ work no spiritual effect in the personal life and personal history of the subject mechanically or magically. The personal experience of forgiveness and the actual development of the objective spiritual relation involves the necessity of repentance and faith on the part of the subject.

The objective efficacious grace of Baptism must be met by a corresponding subjective appropriation of that grace, in order that the subject may actually die unto sin and lead a holy and unblamable life.

The whole truth is expressed in a twofold proposition. Whilst on the one hand we must say: no Baptism, no objective engrafting into the mystical body of Christ; on the other hand we must assert with equal decision: no personal faith, no experience of the forgiveness of sins and no actualized salvation.

Or we may express the truth thus: no Baptism, no adoption; no faith, no salvation.

The principle: no faith, no salvation, is not applicable, using the term *faith* in the ordinary sense, to baptized infants dying in infancy. They are saved in virtue of the gracious relation which they sustain to Christ by Baptism.

9. Baptism is the act of God whereby He adopts the subject

into the sphere of grace, thus giving him a new position, a new objective relation, and the rights of a child. Faith is the act of man, the act of the subject of Baptism, whereby he recognizes and acknowledges his new position and relation, and appropriates to himself the free grace of God by which he has been apprehended. Without the first, faith has no proper warrant, no real relation to validate and justify it. Belief becomes an imagination. Without the second, divine grace is only a latent possibility. The new position into which he has been translated does not and cannot become a transforming power in the heart of the subject, inspiring and governing his will and the whole sphere of his ethical and religious life. The old man is not mortified. The new man is not quickened.

10. The infant children of believing parents are to be baptized.

(1.) Because they need the benefits of Baptism. They need the forgiveness of sin and the new life of the Spirit.

(2.) Because they possess a right to these benefits of the covenant of grace in that they are the children of believing parents.

(3.) Because these benefits are promised to them as infants; and divine grace is able to apprehend them, although they are incapable of the conscious responsive activity of faith.

11. Infants are by Baptism engrafted into the Christian Church; and thus a real distinction is constituted between them and the children of unbelievers.

12. The Baptism of infants in the New Testament is analogous to circumcision in the Old. Baptism works an effect for them relatively to Christ and the Christian's economy as real and great as the effect which circumcision wrought for the children of the Jews relatively to the Mosaic economy.

These theses are warranted, we think, by the sacramental theory in general and the doctrine of Baptism in particular as taught in the Heidelberg Catechism, and are sustained throughout by all the other confessions of the Reformed Church.

ART. V.—DALTON ON THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.*

BY REV. F. K. LEVAN, A. M.

WE have here a truly able, interesting and valuable book. Some guarantee for all this we have already in the well established character of its author, who stands high among German-speaking Christians, as a wise worker and a practical writer, whose welcome has been secured in thousands of homes. Rev. Hermann Dalton is pastor of the large and influential Reformed congregation in St. Petersburg, Russia, consisting of German immigrants and descendants of such, of whom there are many in the Muscovite capital. His popularity has gone beyond the people of his own nationality, and found a response among Russians themselves. When building his large new church a few years ago—unfortunately burnt down just after completion, and now happily rebuilding—even the Czar made liberal and marked contributions.

The ability of the book, we think, lies particularly in the wide field of theology which it covers and handles with the ease of a familiar subject, and in the clearness with which it apprehends the Reformed stand-point as growing out of the general movement of the Reformation, and the manifest sense of the Heidelberg Catechism as viewed in this light. Regarding style it leaves little to be wished for. Doctrines, facts and duties are made to stand in organic harmony and address you with a native winning air, of which much of our theological literature so sadly deprives them. Yet practical everywhere. Recondite wisdom in popular form. Weighty observations taken right out of the real world, richest fruit, and fresh as when first

* *Immanuel.* Der Heidelberger Katechismus als Bekenntnis- und Erbauungsbuch der evangelischen Gemeinde erklärt und an's Herz gelegt von Hermann Dalton. pp. 539. Wiesbaden, 1870.

plucked. A friend of ours lately said that he tried to read Bethune's Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism—very respectable in style and contents, by the way—and found it a task, more than enough. We fear no such remark from an equally capable source with respect to Dalton's work. Racy as a romance, limpidly flowing as the liquid fountain, warmly in sympathy with the universal truth, it breathes throughout the spirit of earnest devotion and loving faith. The author calls his book "Confessional and Devotional." That he has in the main made good his claim for it, constitutes probably its greatest merit, especially for our times. The spirit of our age seems to have unfitted writers, otherwise possessed of ability, for allowing their normal harmony to these twin elements of the Christian life. Confessional authors, as a rule, neither represent nor awaken devotion; while devotional authors very commonly feel constrained to keep at the farthest remove from confessionalism in every form. A practical dualism between them runs through our later literature. Nor will an outward placing them side by side meet the case. There is an inner, normal harmony between them, and the seeing and representing that—naught else—will legitimate itself to the Christian consciousness. Pastor Dalton considers the Heidelberg Catechism as pre-eminently both a Confession and a book of Devotion. The underlying thought holds that as a Confession it is *representative* of all the other Reformed confessions, *general* when they betimes become particular, *inclusive* where perchance the one or the other of them was pressed to become exclusive. This broad basis shuts out no truth of universal force, no single fact or duty which ought to be common to the Christian Church in its most catholic character. It allows and seeks them all. And down on this real bottom—neither imaginary nor arbitrary—of the universal Christian order and system room is found for the true devotional element. It is at home here, and will never be wanting here, where in a most vital sense

"The saints of all ages in harmony meet."

Having such general character we should like to see a wide

circulation to this work. Among other things it would do this double good. To members of the Reformed communion it would help to make clear what a rich inheritance they have in their Catechism and in their absolute kinship, through it, as their confession, in definite form with the history and treasures of Christianity in every age. No one can tell of what moulding account this fact may be in the present upheaved and restless condition of nominal Christendom, if only those who are specially called to its defence will comprehend their position, stand firm in their ranks, and do manful duty under the great Captain of their salvation. Members of other communions would learn more of us than they now know, as a rule; their minds would be freed of misapprehensions, and a more just sense of our relation to the general family of Christians would find place with them.

We propose to let pastor Dalton's book speak mainly for itself, and regret only that our limited space compels the giving of such *disjecta membra*, and these withal culled from but a few of the many rich chapters with which the work abounds. We begin with broken remarks of his on Question XXII. of the Catechism.

"With true faith goes the hearty confidence that *I* have become a partaker of its contents. I must believe in order to know what true faith means, just as I must see to understand light, or live to appreciate life. This truth the Catechism emphasizes with unyielding firmness, and presses home with affectionate interest, and thus secures his just right to each individual person. But with equal positiveness and earnestness on the other hand, it lays stress upon the unalterable contents of faith. They are not matter of opinion which I may believe or not. I neither make nor shape the object of faith; it is God's own doing, the result of His will, which I may only believingly appropriate to myself. Hence the Catechism does not ask what is necessary for thee to believe, but in general: What is necessary for a Christian to believe? What are the contents, by the believing acceptance of which, he, who once was a sinner, knows himself saved through grace." Page 123.

Here we have a distinct statement of the *certitude of faith*, the blessed privilege of each believer, which the Holy Ghost works in his heart, as the Catechism elsewhere expresses it; and at the same time the representation of its sacred contents as of God, and not subject to any change on the part of the human mind or will. After a short sketch of the history and character of the Apostles' Creed as embodying the contents of the Christian faith, our author says:

"So then, the Apostles' Creed is for us the sum of the Gospel. Its several articles stand there in noble simplicity and brevity. Not to prove, they seek only to confess that which the believer has experienced as truth. They do it manfully, fearlessly, freely. Every self-conceit, every private opinion is stripped off these brief words: they are the words of the Apostles. With grand force and decision, in full consciousness of that with which it deals, all side-matters are avoided: only the main facts of the blessed divine mystery are simply set forth. Touch them whosoever listeth. Their forcible, terse style leaves room neither for modification nor doubtful interpretation.

These articles are the common possession of the entire Christian Church, which permits no doubt concerning them. As such treasure in common the Creed is alike dear to us and revered by us. Highly do we honor in it the bond of the faith in the promised *one shepherd and one flock*. May never so many distinctions appear in the further development of the several churches this confession testifies, over and over again, that notwithstanding all divisions, there remains in it the one thing belonging to all, teaching that we are brethren, and may reach forth to each other in spirit, over and above the lines of separation, the fraternal hand of fellowship." Page 127.

From the discussion of the difficult article of the descent into hades we quote the following, taking the liberty simply to direct special attention to the third paragraph as ruling out completely every narrow interpretation of the Catechism's conception of this article.

"Gradually and with slow growth the different articles were taken up into the Apostles' Creed. Not all fruits ripen equally

fast. One point and then another of the Apostolic message struck so directly into the consciousness of the listening church and enkindled faith and hearty consent in such manner that it answered with its Amen, and placed the fact as an added link into the golden chain of its confession. Other points found it less easy to prove their right to admission. A careful test awaited them. The passing zeal of a single congregation was insufficient: the consent of the whole Church, continued through generations, had to be obtained. The longest test fell to the lot of our article concerning the *descent into Hades*. It is the youngest member of the Creed, and had to pass through many trials, ere it won its place of honor and received universal assent.

"Not even yet is there yielded to it the same warm favor and the like hearty trust as to the other articles of the Confession. There remains a certain fear with respect to it, the uncomfortable sense of confronting a doctrine of whose mysterious contents, drawn from the very depths of the divine Word, one has indeed some apprehension but not that clearness of conception needful to a joyous confession. This joy becomes the more difficult for us Germans on account of the ambiguity of expression. While we use the word "hell" almost exclusively to designate the place of the lost, it is here the translation of a word which means the realm of the departed in general, irrespective of the distinction between the saved and the lost.

"Our Church, and especially our Catechism, has taken a position of fullest freedom with respect to this article. The latter has asserted the right to lay stress particularly upon that side of it in which it can believe. As faith is for it a hearty trust, it will not bring it down to the level of a mere doctrinal opinion. Our Church, however, likewise allows the privilege of honoring other points connected with this article, and several of our Confessions have gone further into the sense of this difficult, rich article, and so have enabled other sides thereof to come to their equally well-founded rights." Pp. 209, 210.

We all know how the ambiguity of the word "hell," above referred to, holds with equal force in English. And this mere accident, having nothing whatever to do with the sense of the article, has no doubt been a serious bar to the hearty use of the Creed in the public services of American Churches, as well as a drawback to its cheerful reception as a whole by large portions of English-speaking people. It is matter for congratulation, therefore, that the original word "hades," which carries with it the true sense, is generally being substituted, and so familiarized to the popular mind.

Question LXXIV. of the Catechism relates to infant baptism. We quote several striking passages.

"All nations are to be made disciples. Christianity is not the sum of a certain number of isolated, individual persons, but an inward living organism into which old and young, large and small are of necessity entitled to reception. The family is dedicated unto the Lord, and whole nations are to be dedicated unto Him. His blessing rests upon the whole house and all its inmates, sanctifying each member of it. . . ." Pp. 333-4.

"Rightfully the Catechism points to the circumcision of the old covenant, and declares that baptism has been put into its place in the New Covenant, now of course in evangelic fulness. *Circumcision was the solemn reception of the new-born child from the people of Israel into the covenant of promise. Baptism is the solemn reception of the new-born child from the people of the spiritual Israel of the regeneration into the Covenant of grace, of which the word of the promise also holds true, that it shall be "unto you and your children."* As circumcision was not in itself a guarantee that all who had received it were true sons of Abraham, so also the act of baptism is no guarantee that its subject may not squander the inheritance to which he is called by it. But if the baptized person retains this inheritance in full possession, then baptism remains to him continually the sacred sign and seal of that unchanging paternal love which in the earliest days of his being took pity, and impressed on him, in the holy Sacrament, the kiss of forgiveness, so that his first lisps of prayer might be *Abba Father.*" Pp. 335-6.

These ideas flow in singular harmony with the manifest sense of the Catechism. They indicate also what must be the nature of our author's observations on the sacrament of baptism itself, as he feels himself constrained to make them in the light and under the influence of the questions and answers relating directly to it. We may therefore pass on, and give our attention to his statement of the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Some of the sentences are difficult to translate with justice to every shade of their meaning, and fidelity, at the same time, to English usage. We have sought to do right, as much as possible in each direction.

"Of the first sacrament we have spoken as joining us to the company of the redeemed. Those who have received life from God in baptism, have this life continuously upheld and secured in the holy supper. As its preservation necessarily presupposes the life itself, reference can only here be had to such as prove the possession of this life by their faith. Hence the evident truth that the Lord's Supper is intended for believers only, and that they alone receive what it is appointed to confirm and seal to us." Pp. 340-1.

That the foregoing paragraph is thoroughly Reformed all who have an acquaintance with Reformed symbols at once see. Is it not equally the doctrine on the subject which meets us in the New Testament and in the Church of the first centuries?

From the explanation of the doctrinal teachings of the Catechism, under our present head, we quote as follows:

"The Lord's Supper is represented as the visible holy sign of the blessed divine truth that we have part in the one offering of Christ on the cross and in all His benefits. This sign rests on firmest foundation: The command of Christ and its indwelling promise. God so wills it: therefore it is thus; for His will is sure as a rock. And God's will and promise to believers is that as certainly as I receive this sign of bread and wine so certainly has Christ now also for me offered His body and shed His blood on the cross. Bread and wine witness to me the truth of this act of God's love, convince the eye, as the

ear has already been convinced by the word, of the blessed work of Christ.

But not sign only, a seal also is the Lord's Supper. The holiest deed of God's love, as an abounding mystery into whose depths no searching human eye can pierce, holds with this sign, inwardly and intimately, as thought is contained in speech. With the outer transaction is bound up an inner act, well represented in that other, that audible means of grace, the preaching of the Gospel. The ear receives the sound-wave of the word in a mechanical manner, and mechanically, artificially sound and wave die away. Not simply sound, however, was it that touched the ear. With it was united wonderfully, mysteriously, the thought, intended not for the ear, which, as a passage-way only, enabled it to enter the region of thought and secure itself hospitable reception in the life of faith. Even such is the way of the visible sign. From the hand of the Lord's minister the believer receives the bread and the cup for his bodily sustenance; but with this outer, the Lord has connected, by innermost bonds, a spiritual transaction. Simultaneously with the bodily act, and mediated by it as hearing is the means of understanding, the soul of the believer eats and drinks of the Lord's crucified body and shed blood." Pp. 341-3.

We give the remarks of our author on the famous *Eightieth* question in full. It may be said of him that he goes here over unusually difficult ground with the clear perception of an enlightened theologian and the irenical spirit of a true Christian pastor, stating clearly and concisely the Reformed, and, we may add, the general Protestant position on this *questio vexata*.

"No question of the Catechism has called forth as much strife, or is connected with as large a history not in all respects to be approved, as this. With deep earnestness, but also with unflinching decision, the justification for which must indeed be owned, it lays bare a perversion of the Lord's Supper. This, however, may be said, that it would probably have been better if this justification had been simply turned to use in a critical investigation, reaching the same conclusion of necessity from our stand-point, instead of in a popular hand-book which every-

where lays down the doctrines of Holy Scripture in a clear positive manner.

“In the first edition the Eightieth question is wanting. Shortly after its appearance news comes to Heidelberg that the Council of Trent in its last sessions, July 16th, and September 17th, 1562, had visited with heavy anathemas all those who failed to agree with the Catholic Church in the doctrine of transubstantiation, worship of Christ in the sacrament, offering of the mass, and withdrawal of the cup from the laity. This led Frederick III. of his own authority, to add the 80th question to the second edition, yet without the last clause. While it was going through the press, and when few copies of the second edition had as yet been given out, the Elector presumably received the literal wording of the Tridentine resolutions with their anathemas against the Evangelical Church, and allowed himself to be influenced by it to add to the 80th question in the third edition, the sentence: “so that the mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry.”

Thus offense is made to stand against offense; on the side of the Elector an angry acceptance of the challenge which the entire Council had offered to the youthful Church—a living picture of those unkindly days of strife for the possession of the truth.

“To an evagelic mind entering wholly with hearty trust and confidence into the spirit of Scripture, and drawing bountifully the streams of the all-gracious love of God from that fountain, it is matter of discomfort to see and feel what has become in the hands of men of the holy sign and seal of the eternal divine truth of our communion with Christ. The whole world scarcely affords a greater perversion, and the honest soul may well fear in sight of such delusion.

“By one offering He (Christ) hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. By His own blood He entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others:

for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many."

"A prophetic vein runs through these words of the Epistle to the Hebrews. They stand there witnessing against views to which coming centuries first gave form. It is the earnest protest of the Apostles, as though forward over the grave, against a doctrine, which, in full contradiction of Scripture, declares that both the living and the dead have only then the forgiveness of sins through Christ's sufferings, if He is daily offered by the priests in the mass. What an inexpressibly misconceived idea! that daily, in thousands and thousands of churches, there transpires repeatedly a fact whose original occurrence, once for all, made the soul of the Saviour sorrowful unto death, and called forth from Him the words of anguish, '*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?*'"

"Holy Scripture teaches, furthermore, that we become incorporated into Christ, the High Priest, who sits at the right hand on the throne of the majesty in heaven, He having ascended into heaven and remaining there until He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. But in the mass they teach that Christ abides not in heaven alone, but, as in the days of His flesh, is bodily, though under the form of bread and wine, present here on earth. Holy Scripture enjoins us to seek that which is above, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of God, and declares that He will there be worshiped; the mass teaches to bow the knee before the bread enclosed in the monstrance inasmuch as Christ is not in heaven but in it.

"Frederick the Third calls this with full right a denial of the one offering of Jesus Christ. He describes it correctly as idolatry, in so far as before the host, that is, before a creature, obeisance is made and worship given, whereas we are to worship God the Lord, and Him only." Pp. 356-60.

ART. VI.—THE UNION OF THE DIVINE AND HUMAN IN
JESUS CHRIST.

BY DR. L. SCHÖBERLEIN, PROF. AND CONSISTORIALRATH IN GÖTTINGEN.

No one who has ever contemplated the character of Jesus, has been able to deny His intellectual and moral greatness. What He has spoken is so simple and thoroughly intelligible, and yet, at the same time, so exalted and profound, it so strangely penetrates the inmost recesses of the soul and works conviction therein, His life is so immaculate, His personality stands before us so exalted, and all His actions are so thoroughly pervaded, notwithstanding His holy earnestness and zeal, with such an utterly unselfish, compassionate, self-sacrificing and helpful love, and this His high and pure disposition, He maintained so consistently and perfectly even in persecution and suffering even to the death on the cross, that of all men who have lived in the world, no one has appeared more exalted than He; aye, that no one can even be compared with Him.

But have we done full justice to the person of Jesus, when we have said of Him: He is the greatest among the children of men? His disciples saw something higher in Him; they speak of a glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father, which they saw in Him full of grace and truth. And what is yet more, He ascribes to Himself a dignity superior to that of other men, calls God His Father in a special sense, and speaks of a glory which He had with Him before the foundation of the world, and with which He would again glorify Him. These are words of infinite weight; since if they are not true, they destroy His intellectual and moral greatness, and place Him far below other heroes of humanity; but if, as cannot be otherwise, they are truth, they require us in our mind and spirit, to admit the divine, which was manifested in Him. The Church, therefore, on the ground of this testimony of Christ with re-

gard to Himself, and of the unanimous declaration of His disciples and apostles, as also on the ground of her own infallible experience of the regenerating and beautifying power of His Spirit, has from the beginning believed and confessed Him to be the only begotten Son of God, who from love to us became man; and this faith is so deeply rooted in her consciousness, that with it she stands or falls.

But how are we to understand this union of the divine and human in the person of Christ?

This point would present but little difficulty, if we were allowed to regard the divine in Him as a special measure of the divine Spirit, which, either at His birth or at His baptism, was communicated to Him. He would then appear before us as one of the prophets, as that prophet of Israel, who had been endowed above all other prophets with the Spirit of God. The union of these two elements would also become more easily understood, if we accept what is taught from an opposite direction, viz.: that the divine, which from the beginning was immanent in the world, had at the proper time (in the person of Jesus) fully manifested itself and assumed a visible form; and that therefore He is to be regarded as the foreordained bearer of the divine in the history of mankind. According to the former hypothesis, the divine is regarded as a higher endowment communicated to men; according to the latter as an inborn power of man; and in the case of Jesus we would only be required to complement these views by asserting that this general gift to men was imparted to Christ in its highest measure; or, that this power of the divine naturally immanent in the human race, had in Jesus arrived at its perfect effervescence.

There is a measure of truth in both of these views. Jesus was really anointed with the Holy Ghost in a special measure, and He is designated in the Holy Scriptures as the promised prophet, as the Prophet of prophets. Jesus is really the spiritual perfection of humanity, the true central fact of world-history, the second and spiritual Adam, who, just as the first Adam was the beginning of its natural life, became for it the principle of its spiritual life. But does this do full justice to

the divine in Jesus? Not as mere gift or natural property, not as mere power or particular manifestation, does the picture of the divine in Jesus, which the Scriptures give, present itself to us; but it appears in Him in true personal form.

An independent existence, which He possessed from eternity is ascribed to Him, when it is said of the Word which had become Flesh in Jesus, that it was "in the beginning" (John i. 1); and when Jesus testifies concerning Himself: "Before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 58). And this existence, although divine in its nature, is again distinguished from the existence of God, when John says of this eternal Word on the one hand, "the word was God;" and on the other hand, "the Word was with God;" when, moreover, he speaks of Him as the "only begotten Son," who from eternity was "in the bosom of the Father" (John i. 18), and had "a glory with the Father before the world was" (John xvii. 5); and when Paul calls Him "the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature," (Col. i. 15); when the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls Him "the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person" (Heb. i. 3). And if it is implied already in these passages, that the Son, in this His existence before time, is not to be regarded as a mere *impersonal* principle, but as a true *personal* being; this finds still further confirmation from the fact that He is represented as working independently, when John says further of that Word which was eternally God, with God, that: "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." (John i. 3): When Paul declares of this image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature, that "all things were created by Him, and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist." (Col. i. 16-17). Nor does it less imply a personal existence from eternity, when the Son is said to have been sent by the Father, and when Jesus in a like sense says: "I came forth from the Father: again I go to the Father." (John xvi. 28).

What is presented to us here in these passages of Scripture, stands also in essential harmony with the nature and life of God, as the Church, also on the ground of the Scriptures, un-

derstands and teaches it. If we were required to worship in God only a lawgiver, who has prescribed to the human race a certain order of life, and, if they virtuously live according to it has promised to them eternal happiness, then, in order to bring back to the path of righteousness and virtue the race that had departed from this norm, it might have been sufficient if God had sent down upon a certain man a special measure of His Spirit with a view to clearer knowledge and holy power, so that, as prophet and Messias, He might by precept and example show the path of virtue to others. Finally, if we see in God only that power and that life, which pervades the entire world, and gradually acquires consciousness in the increasing civilization and morality of the human race; if, in this way, we do not attribute unto God a personal and independent existence over and above humanity, then we may perhaps speak eloquent words concerning the divine, or concerning the indwelling of God in Jesus: but yet viewed more closely, Jesus is after all nothing more than a son of man, like the rest of us, and it is only a greater measure of natural endowment, which distinguishes Him from us, and assigns to Him a position, prominent above that of all others, in the development of the human race. The Church of Christ knows and has a different God, a living, personal one, who stands free as Lord over all His creatures. And this, His lordship, is no lordship of mere power, or of abstract law; on the contrary the inmost life of His nature *is love*; and when He created us, He appointed us to be His children, in order to communicate with us as a father with his children. How otherwise can this His love satisfy itself, how otherwise can this our estate as children become truth and life, than by entering our creatural nature and thus becoming personally united to us? And after we were plunged by sin into darkness and death, was it possible for Him to leave His children to themselves, although certainly we deserved nothing else at His hands? Or could it have delivered us from the chains of darkness, and could thus the power of death have been broken, if He had presented to us as pattern and guide a man endowed with higher gifts of knowledge and virtue? No, in such a case only love

in personal form can save, and only by following her children into their misery can she satisfy her own nature. The same love, which in God eternally generated the Son, and created us in the image of the Son, it is, which in its own heart from eternity determined to show mercy towards us, and sent the Son into the world to save us, who without Him would have perished. But the Son, as He fulfils all the will of God, accepted also with the eternal compassion of love this counsel of redemption and left the bosom of the Father; He, the only begotten, in order to take upon Himself the nature of His created though apostate image, and, restoring in Himself this image in its full truth, thus to restore us as children of God. And the Holy Ghost, who in God and His kingdom is the medium of love, by His divine power brought the eternal Son into humanity, in order thus also to be in this temporal existence of the Son the bond between Him and His heavenly Father, and to be the agent in the accomplishment of His work of redemption.

The Divine counsel of redemption has its root thus in the triune love of God itself. From eternity already, when God yet bore in His heart the design of creation, His wisdom had its delight in the children of men. (Prov. 8:31.) The eye of the Father's love turns from eternity through the Son towards man, the work of His good pleasure. And the Son, the principle of the revelation of the Divine nature, has from all eternity His life not in Himself, but in the surrender of His heart and nature to mankind, which forever presents itself in the glory of His own image to His mind and spirit. In like manner also the Son from all eternity looks upon man not otherwise than in blessed union with Himself, man's prototype, that so through love He may reflect the image of His holiness and righteousness. (Eph. 4:10.) The *human-divine character of the Son* is hence an *everlasting fact*, and the above-cited Scriptural references concerning the eternal personality of the Son can be fully understood only from this point of view. And if, in order to distinguish this everlasting human-divine nature from its actualization in time, we designate it as an *ideal* one, this must nevertheless not be understood in the sense of a

mere thought, or of an abstract decree, but as that full power of life, according to which ideas are the final and highest cause of everything real, and are therefore themselves the completest realities. When therefore God had created man in the image in which He had from everlasting contemplated him in the God-man, we must not be surprised that God, as the Scriptures tell us, walked and conversed with man in paradise, in which He had placed him. This paradisaic revelation of God to man is only the first terrestrial expression of that eternal desire of divine love, to dwell with the children of men. But this love of God to the children of men has not been destroyed by sin; its method of expression has only been changed to accommodate it to the changed condition of things, and thus it has become stronger, deeper, and more confirmed. (1 Peter, 1: 19, 20; Rev. 13: 8.) And that the Lord God visited Abraham, that He spoke with Moses from the burning bush and from the thunders of Sinai, that in the pillar of fire and the pillar of a cloud He led His people, that by the angel of His covenant He gave commands and promises, and by His Spirit gave prophecies of salvation to the elect of His people, in order to prepare them for the fulfillment of the same all these are only significant preludes for His actual entrance into humanity, and for His abiding and walking in our flesh. But when the time was fulfilled, when the insufficiency of all human power and wisdom to overcome the power of sin had been historically proved; when the civil and social life of the people had arrived at that point, that a way was opened to their hearts to admit the testimony of the grace of God; when, above all, the Lord had, by the institutions of the law and by the promises of the prophets, prepared for Himself a suitable dwelling-place in the midst of His chosen people of Israel; then the Son of God Himself appeared in the flesh, in order that, having passed through a life in the flesh even unto death, He might, by taking upon Himself in the obedience of love, all the consequences of our sin, blot out for us the guilt and power of sin.

But how, now, is this wonderful event, that the Son of God became man, man in the flesh, to be understood?

That this could not have taken place in the ordinary way of nature, that the Son of God could be born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, this needs no farther demonstration. For independent of the fact, that in this way Jesus would have taken part by birth in our sinful nature, although He had come to break in the nature of the flesh the power of sin, the state of the case here was otherwise than in the ordinary birth of a human being, where the person, which by the will of God was to enter into the world, had previously had no existence. But here this person is already existing, existing in the Son of God, who from all eternity had been in the form of God, but who now, denying Himself out of love to us, took upon Himself the form of a servant, that so, by becoming like unto us, He might make us like unto Himself.

Just as little could the incarnation take place by the Son of God uniting Himself with a man already in existence. For in such a case a twofold personality would come into existence, since in Jesus the personality of the eternal Son of God, and the personality of a man already existing in time, would become united. The dualism of this personality could in such a case be avoided only by confining the indwelling of the Son of God to a constant spiritual influence, which the Son of God would exert upon this chosen man. But this, after all, would be essentially the same view as the one we have already set aside, which sees in Jesus a mere man, though filled in an extraordinary degree with the Spirit of God. It could not be called a real incarnation.

No, the Son of God, when He became man, did not enter a man, but took upon Himself *human nature*. But for the very reason that He entered into human nature, He could not exist in it with divine self-consciousness—for personality and nature form a harmonious union in respect to essence, and the particular manner of self-consciousness is conditioned by the particular manner of nature, and the reverse—but He could exist in it only with human self-consciousness. In order to become *really* human, it was necessary for Him, in taking upon Himself human nature, to make His personality (His self-conscious

ego) a truly human one. Whilst from eternity He had existed as a *divine* person in the holy life-cycle of the divine trinity, it now became necessary for Him to become a *human person* in the *human nature of the flesh*, in order that, becoming like us in all things, above all in His self-consciousness, He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. (Heb. 2 : 17.)

This took place by the power of the Father through the Holy Spirit. The Virgin Mary was the chosen one from the sinful human race, who was to become the mother of the Lord ; she who, descended from the family of David, was by her humility and faith prepared to receive this holy gift from the bosom of the Father. The Holy Ghost came upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her. And she, as a poor child of man, conceived and gave birth to the only begotten of the Father. (Luke 1 : 35.)

He became like unto us in *all things*. He took upon Himself no mere apparent body, but a real body, the body of the creature ; not a body of a paradisaic nature, much less a glorified body ; for how could such a body have engrafted itself organically upon this world of flesh, and how die for us ? On the contrary, it was a *body of the flesh*, like unto our own present body, unfolding itself from year to year according to the law of growth, subject to all the necessities, wants and infirmities of terrestrial existence, yea, bearing in Himself the germ of death, in order truly to bear for us the wages of sin, in order to be able to suffer and die for us.

But the humanity which He took upon Himself consisted not merely in His body, whilst His eternal *deus-ego* was substituted for his Human *soul*. For the soul is the most special characteristic of man, the very bearer of the human self-conscious I. And if He had not at the same time a human soul, His becoming man would have been a mere sham. This appears most plainly from all that the Scriptures report concerning Him. He learned, thought, investigated and increased, both in years and wisdom ; He shared our feelings of joy and sorrow, He had human inclinations and aims, and

proceeded from the dim desire of the good forward to the clear apprehension and steadfast prosecution of this His life-aim. Thus He became altogether like unto us, both in body and soul, only with one exception, viz.: that, since He had not become man in the way of natural generation, but by the power of the Holy Ghost, He did not share in that inclination to sin, which is the heritage of all the children of Adam; but that as a new and spiritual Adam of the race, he was free from inborn inclination to sin, and that he was by nature as pure, as the first Adam came pure from the hands of the Creator.

But if Jesus thus became in body and soul like unto us, sin excepted, may not then, perhaps, His divine nature have taken in Him the place of our *spirit*? This also we must deny. The creative Spirit from God, which has been imparted to our nature as the principle of life, belongs to the very integrity of this our nature. For just through this, His natural immanence in our soul, our consciousness becomes self-consciousness, our thinking and willing receives the form of reason and liberty, and we ourselves become capable of communion with God. But if Jesus had not taken part in this, the highest which belongs to the constitution of man, in this fundamental force of all spiritual and intellectual life, how could He have become the noblest of the children of men, or how could He have represented in His person the very flower of humanity?

Thus Jesus was *true man* also, man in the fullest sense of the word. And this man Jesus is no other *ego* than the *ego* of the eternal Son, which became man in Him.

But did nothing of His divine nature pass over into this His human form of existence? If this were to be understood as if Jesus during His walk on earth had borne in Himself alongside of His human feeling, thinking, willing and working another divine feeling, thinking, willing and working, then we would be forced to deny it. For the verity of the humanity of Jesus would necessarily be compromised, if, in the terrestrial man Jesus His divine nature had been united in self-conscious activity with His human nature. And this objection may be urged against every manner, in which we may think of this

union. If we suppose that the two were mixed together, and were thus changed into one nature, then Jesus is not a true-God-man, but rather something between God and man, of which it were difficult to form a clear conception. And if we suppose that they existed in Jesus *separated* and alongside of each other, then we would admit in Him a dual personality, which had performed some things on earth with divine, and other things with human consciousness and will; but with this the harmonious image of the person of Christ would be lost.

But even if we conceive of the union as something midway between mixture and separation, which is in itself the true manner of a real union, it would nevertheless be a mistake to locate it in the temporal life of Jesus on earth. This becomes very apparent, if we form in reference to this union the conclusion, which by itself is also true (and which has been formed by the Lutheran Church in the Form of Concord), that thereby a living communication of attributes from the divine to the human nature has taken place. For if with the Suabian theologians (in the controversy at the beginning of the seventeenth century on this point), we assert, that Jesus, whilst with the powers of His human nature He performed His work of redemption, secretly with the powers of His divine nature continues to govern heaven and earth; or assert with the theologians of Hessen, that Jesus, although He possessed the divine nature, had denied Himself the exercise of it, except in special cases, such as miracles, where He suffered it to appear; by both assertions the image of Christ as of a true man is spoiled. For whilst the former supposition, by the distinction which it makes between that which was manifest and that which was concealed, invests the person of Jesus with a dim and magical haze; so the latter introduces, by an arbitrary use of His divine powers, an element of change into His works.

No, if we would conceive of the self-abnegation of the Son of God in becoming man as a real one, then we must proceed to the conclusion, that He had left behind Him His heavenly glory (John 17 : 5), *aye*, even His divine form (Phil. 2 : 6, 7), *i. e.*, the divine manner of His being, thinking and working;

and that He had not brought these along with Him into His earthly condition of servant. On earth Jesus was not omnipotent, although He performed great miracles, and was able even to perform them independent of space (Matt. 6: 5, 13); for He gave His disciples the promise that they should perform still greater miracles than His (John 14: 12), and the power for His own miracles He obtained from the Father by prayer (John 10: 25, 37, 11: 41). Just as little did He on earth possess omnipresence, but He ascended into heaven, to fill all things. (Eph. 4: 10). Nor was He omniscient, although His perception was deeper than that of other children of flesh (John 2: 25); for the day of judgment was unknown to Him, and He knew of it as little as the angels: the Father alone knew it (Mark 13: 32). Just as little as He did anything on earth with divine power, just so little did He do it with divine consciousness and will. As a general thing, nothing is to be found in His life, which transcended the bounds of human nature, so far as this is apprehended in its purity and spiritual power, and which His followers, although only through Him, the spiritual Adam, and in a manner different according to the central position which He holds, might do and live after Him.

Just in this way the Son of God in His incarnation has manifested the nature of love, which in its perfect participation and communication is always accompanied in its self-surrendry by self-denial

But what is the extent of this self-denial on the part of divine love, this self-abnegation (Kenosis—Phil. ii. 7. *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωθε*) of the Son of God in His incarnation?

In more recent times the opinion has been advanced, that the Son of God, when He became man, actually renounced His Godhead, that during the time of His earthly career extending over several decades, He was not God at all, that during this time the Father ceased to beget the Son, and the Son ceased to send forth the Holy Ghost as well as to rule over heaven and earth in conjunction with the Father and the Holy Ghost. It is only at His exaltation that the Son again receives His

divinity from the Father as a reward for His redemptive work in the flesh.* However willing we may be to recognize in this theory a decisive tendency to make earnest with the self-abnegation involved in the incarnation as an act of love, and to guard against all interference of divine consciousness and activity in the earthly person of the man Jesus, we cannot help thinking that in this way violence is done to another and a no less essential side of the character of love, that namely according to which love, with all its earnestness of self-surrendry to another, does yet not renounce itself, but rather even in its deepest self-denial, maintains its own character as well as its natural and moral individuality, just as it also asserts and preserves its holiness and righteousness in its mercy and grace.

That the Son is begotten of the Father and that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son is a relation grounded in the very nature of the Godhead, as we have it expressed in the dogma of the trinity. In this relation it is therefore utterly impossible to eliminate either one side or the other. Begetting belongs to the essential nature of the Father. He *has* not merely begotten the Son, He *begets* Him eternally (according to the teaching of Scripture and of the Church). Would therefore the Father still be Father if He ceased to beget the Son? And would not the nature of the Holy Ghost be changed, if He proceeded only from the Father and not at the same time from the Son? If the Son passes out of this essential relation for a time does the trinity become a duality? And is a duality still the true godhead? Thus this doctrine of the absolute *Kenosis* does violence to the nature of the divine trinity. And this is true also of the activity of the trinity. Every activity of God in the preservation and government of the world proceeds *from* the Father, *through* the Son, *in* the Holy Ghost. Hence the "through" of the divine activity cannot be interrupted for a time, as would be the necessary consequence if the Son should withdraw from the communion of the divine life; for the preservation of that which exists is a con-

* Gess, die Lehre von der Person Christi, entwickelt aus dem Bewusstsein Christi und aus dem Zeugnisse der Apostel. Basel, 1856.

tinuous activity of God, which accomplishes its end essentially in this threefold form. Neither can this activity of the Son be temporarily assumed by the Father or the Holy Ghost, because these persons of the trinity in distinction from the Son already have their definite place in the divine activity, and because moreover this reciprocity of "from," "through," and "in" is grounded in the immanent relation of the divine persons to one another.

But this hypothesis of an absolute *kenosis* is in conflict not only with the nature and activity of the trinity but also with the nature of the Son as *absolute* personality, as *God*, which He is equally with the Father and the Holy Ghost. True the Son has life not from Himself, but has received it from the Father. The Father, however, has at the same time given to Him to have life in Himself, and thus to be God absolutely as the Father. Now how can the Son cease absolutely to be God, and suffer His divine self-consciousness to be extinguished? Just as little as God, inasmuch as He is absolute love, can ever cease to assert this His moral self, *i. e.*, cease to be good, to be love, so little can He inasmuch as He is absolute spirit, renounce His metaphysical self, *i. e.* cease to be absolute Spirit, to be God. This would not be self-abnegation, but self-transformation.

If we look at the formal side of the subject we meet with the same difficulties for thought. That the Son is begotten of the Father, and that the Holy Ghost proceeds from both, and that the Son with the Father and the Holy Ghost govern heaven and earth, involves a relation which is neither concluded once for all, nor yet as something that becomes established through succession in time, but which subsists in an eternal present, and is yet continuously bringing itself to pass. How now can this eternal present, which itself does not run through a course of years, be interrupted, say for thirty years? Would not this be to *transfer time into eternity*? Even though eternity, so far as it is living existence, admits of a certain kind of *unfolding* (*Entfaltung*), which cannot be conceived of without a certain succession, this unfolding must be regarded as essentially different from development (*Entwicklung*) to which all life in

time is subject. As eternity has its own mode of life, so also, has it its own basis of life, which cannot be interrupted or temporarily suspended by life in time. If the Son of God enters into time as man, He lives through a course of temporal existence, and experiences the gradual development of our human life, but in His divine being itself, He can by no means have a temporal experience of the succession of time life, without interfering with the eternity which is an attribute of His divine life, or even abrogating the eternity of the Godhead itself.

Thus the doctrine of the absolute *kenosis* of the Son of God in the incarnation, encounters insuperable difficulties. This has been felt by others,* who avoiding the extreme consequence that the Son of God renounced His divine being, have confined themselves to the assumption that He surrendered only His divine glory, whilst yet He did not cease to retain possession of His divine being. This view seems somewhat plausible at first, and appears to be in harmony with Holy Scripture, when Jesus speaks of a glory which He had with the Father before the foundation of the world, which however He did not possess on earth, and yet would receive again from the Father. But we must not forget that the Scriptures go further and speak also of a divine form, of an equality with God, which the Son of God laid aside during the time of His earthly life. If now these words should be made to mean that this laying aside of His glory involves a real temporary cessation of the same it would be necessary also to draw the same inference in regard to His equality with God. And accordingly this limitation of the *kenosis* is, to say the least, in closer harmony with the Scriptures, than the *kenosis* in its absolute form. Apart from this want of harmony with the Scriptures, this view involves intrinsic difficulties of no trifling character. For where is the boundary between the glory of the divine being, and the divine being itself? Some have placed it in this, that the Son of God laid aside only His divine attributes (*Eigenschaften*), and not His essential divine qualities, (*Wesensbestimmtheiten*). Among

* Thomasius, Beiträge zur Kirchlichen Christologie. 1845. Also, Christi Person und Werk, 1845.

the former are reckoned His omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence; but among the latter His truth, holiness, justice, etc., or in other words His moral constitution. But apart from the arbitrary change in the use of terms—for we are accustomed also to reckon God's holiness, truth, etc., among His attributes—it is difficult to see how the Son of God can lay aside absolute knowledge and power, and yet retain in His knowledge and volition the form of the absolute. Absoluteness is just that which distinguishes the divine as such. If absolute knowledge and volition are incompatible with self-abnegation, how can absoluteness in knowledge and volition be compatible with it? Absoluteness is altogether incompatible with the nature of temporal being. And when the Son of God condescends to become the man Jesus, His holiness, truth etc., without ceasing to be holy, true, etc., necessarily assumes a created, human form. We are confirmed in this belief when we apply it to the life of Jesus. How, for example, is it possible to conceive that the Son of God whilst on earth ceased to know all that He knew before, and began with knowing nothing at all in order that He might again gradually acquire knowledge? On the other hand, if Jesus whilst in the flesh, possessed absolute divine holiness—which however, the Scriptures distinctly deny,* how could the temptation which actually and necessarily confronted Him, be for Him a real temptation, inasmuch as God cannot be tempted to evil?†

The way in which it is attempted to explain how the Son of God laid aside His glory in His divine activity, is arbitrary in a similar manner. The proposition is laid down that the Son of God in His incarnation transformed His eternal demiurgic activity (as manifested in the natural preservation and government of the world) into a redemptive activity; and that ever since He preserves the world only in that He reconciles it with God. True, His expiation is a spiritual preservation of the world. But if we were to make earnest with this thought it would be necessary to draw the inference that the specific activity of the Son had this spiritual form from all eternity, as

* Matt. xix. 17; Heb. v. 8.

† James i. 13.

well as in the preparation for the incarnation and redemption, and that it held in this form alone. To assume however that the Son of God, before His incarnation, co-operated in the natural creation and preservation of the world, but from the time of His incarnation ceased from this natural activity and instead of it assumed the spiritual activity of redemption—this breaks up the unity of the divine activity, and rests at the same time upon a misapprehension of the significance which attaches to the natural activity of God, as the basis continually of His spiritual activity. The purpose of the incarnation for the redemption of humanity, existed from eternity. Now if, notwithstanding this, the Son of God participated in the demiurgic activity of God before His manifestation in the flesh, then He must continue to participate in it beyond the period of His redemptive work to the final completion of all things, even though this activity is in unity with His redemptive activity in such sense that it is its basis as from the beginning.

Accordingly, this supposition of a merely partial self-abnegation necessitates assumptions which cannot stand before the forum of strict science. And in what difficulties, moreover, do we become involved with regard to the Divine in the man Jesus? If we suppose that the Son of God remained God in His incarnation, it is necessary to assume that when He became incarnate, His Godhead sank into a state of total unconsciousness, in order to rise gradually again into clear God-consciousness. And how then, in the further development of Jesus, is His God-consciousness, which remains unchanged in His entire inner life, compatible with the self-consciousness of His earthly personality, which is in all respects that of a created being? These difficulties in which the doctrine of a limited *kenosis* is involved, are in truth inferior to those which stand in the way of the doctrine of an absolute *kenosis*. And yet, by giving up the logical consequence of this self-abnegation we do not even escape what we have above recognized as an inevitable necessity; viz.: that by the incarnation in time, the specific flow of eternity is interrupted and broken.

The true conception of the union of the divine and the

human in Jesus becomes evident to us from the nature of love. It is the very nature of love to take part in the life of the beloved object. And divine love, in virtue of the absoluteness of its relation to the creature, is capable of doing this in such an absolute sense that it assumes the very nature of the creature made in its image. The Son of God, as the Son of man, Jesus, lives on earth truly and purely as man in the flesh, with human consciousness and will, according to the laws of earthly temporal existence. Thus far we assent to the above doctrine of the *kenosis*. But we have regard at the same time to the essential limits of love. And these consist in this, that love, whilst in fullest self-surrendry, it takes part in the life of its object, does nevertheless not surrender to its object its own being, and with this its natural and moral individuality; it much rather preserves this individuality in order to complement its own being by communicating to and receiving from another, and to bring to pass in this way mutual personal union, which is the highest and last end of love. For this reason (and in this respect we dissent from this doctrine, the *kenosis*) it is necessary to add to the proposition which we have considered, the following: *When the Son of God became man, He by no means renounced His divine nature, and the demiurgic activity connected with it; but with divine consciousness and divine power He eternally in Heaven, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, rules over all things.*

In order to understand this, we must not seek the union of the divine and human forms of existence, primarily in the self-consciousness of the earthly man, Jesus, but at the point whence the incarnation itself proceeds, namely, in the Son of God, who in Jesus became man. Inasmuch as the Son of God as the eternal Logos, created man in the image of God, and adapted him to communion with God, there exists, according to the power of love, as we have above seen, from all eternity, an ideal union of the Son of God with humanity, since the Son of God desires no other relation for Himself than that of union with the creature made in His image, that is humanity; and desires and looks upon humanity in no other

relation than in union with Himself. All created existence, which is eternally thought and willed by God, enters by internal necessity into Him, and real existence in order to become actual. This holds good also of the ideal humanity of the Son of God; its manifestation in the flesh is only the revelation and actualization in time of that eternal relation. And that this ideal humanity did not shrink from following man after he fell from God by sin, into the consequences of his sin, even unto death, this is only the manifestation of the entire height and depth, power and truth of the love which eternally fills and moves the heart of the Son towards humanity. This actualization in time of the eternal humanity of the Son of God carries with it, however, the necessary consequence, that the union of God and man, which exists eternally (ideally) in the Son, shall now pass over into the antithesis of the eternal and the temporal, of the heavenly and the earthly; for the divine form of existence, as this lies in the nature of the absolute, remains bound to heaven and eternity, whilst the human form of existence descends from its eternal heavenly ideality into the temporal earthly reality. This, however, takes place in such a way that the essential eternal union of the two forms of existence in the Son of God is not destroyed.

On the basis of divine love and grace, there exists rather in the Son of God the union of a double mode of existence. He both wills and knows Himself at the same time in a divine, eternal, and in a human, temporal existence: uniting and yet distinguishing both in Himself, He, the same *ego* that is from eternity and to eternity, is also in time; there without beginning and end, here during the span of a human life; there as the unlimited, here as the finite, limited; there with eternal consciousness and divine will, here with a divine consciousness and human will—yet in such a manner that He, existing in one mode, knows Himself to be one with the other and *vice versa*.

This relation may be compared to a centre with two qualitatively different peripheries: the one common centre is the

ego of the Son of God, and the two peripheries are His divine and His human modes of existence, the former belonging to heaven and eternity, the latter to earth and time. This double existence of the Son of God might at first seem to involve a double personality. The reason of this is, that in order to form a perfect conception, a twofold mode of existence of the Son of God, we must assume a twofold point of view, the one in time, the other in eternity. But the knowledge acquired from these two stand-points may be comprehended in the actuality of *one person*. And the appearance of a double personality vanishes as soon as we rightly apprehend the relation of time and eternity, of heaven and earth, into which the life of the Son of God appears to be divided.

Heaven and earth, time and eternity are not qualitatively identical, and only quantitatively different. Each of them has its special life, and on the basis of this, its special mode of existence. In eternity as the form of perfected life, we have to do no longer with earthly development, but with heavenly unfolding (*Entfaltung*). And if in this latter we may also assume a succession, it is still not of such a kind that the moments are separate and mutually exclusive, but rather that they are essentially in one another. And accordingly we can not find in eternity a parallelism of experience with our time life. For the eternity of the divine Logos, the time of His earthly humiliation during thirty odd years, is not a period which He has experienced in the same manner in His eternal consciousness as a succession of years; it is only a point, and that not measurable in time, but rather a mathematical point.* It is necessary to suppose that the earthly realization of the purpose of humiliation, is taken up into the consciousness of the Son of God in the same eternal moment in which He formed that purpose, so that there can arise no moment of time, much less a series of years in which the *ego* of the Son of God could have been really separated into the two forms of existence, namely, the heavenly, eternal and the

* Pa. 90: 4. 2 Pet. 3: 8.

earthly time-life, as into two divided halves running parallel to each other. Furthermore nothing new enters into the consciousness of the Son of God through the actualization in time of that eternal purpose, inasmuch as His earthly humanity is only the issue completed in time of a personal union with humanity through love—a union which, in essential ideality, exists from all eternity as the ideal incarnation.

Nor can we find a point of connection for a twofold personal existence in the consciousness of the Man Jesus, any more than in the consciousness of the eternal Logos. For His eternal being did not for His human mode of apprehension in time, run parallel with His earthly being, nor did His heavenly consciousness and activity ever enter His human experience, much less did He make use of His heavenly consciousness and activity for Himself and His redemptive work; but rather just as the eternal life for which we hope appears to *our* minds as something future, although it does not lie for us purely in the future, but is already in principle implanted in us through faith, so also the divine glory of Jesus did not enter into His consciousness as something present, but as something future, as a gift which He should receive from His Father only as a reward. And in respect to this, His self-consciousness differs from ours only in the fact, that it is for Him not something merely future, but also something past, because independently of His incarnation He existed already from eternity as *ego* in the divine Trinity, but laid aside His eternal form of existence, when He became incarnate.

And what is true of eternity is true also of heaven as the sphere to which His divine form of existence belongs. The relation of heaven to earth (by heaven, however, we mean not the cosmical heaven of sun, moon, and stars, but the hyper-physical heaven; the invisible place of perfection*) is not one of space in the earthly sense, so that Heaven may be found at a certain measurable distance from us in the universal cosmical space. Heaven, for our earthly existence in space, is much

* 2 Cor. 4:18.

rather a place above the category of space. Hence it was not necessary for the Son of God, when He became man, to travel a great distance; and just as little is heaven a place which for the man Jesus lay at a remote inaccessible point. His Father was everywhere near to Him, and the angels of heaven were constantly ascending from and descending upon Him.* There was therefore neither in time nor in space a separation of the heavenly and earthly existence of the Son of God, so as to involve a double personality on His part as a consequence.

But not only was there no separation of the same; we ought rather to conceive of them in true living union. The relation between time and eternity, heaven and earth, is not one of mere juxtaposition; time and eternity, heaven and earth are at the same time in each other, and that according to the law of causation. Eternity is continuously the life basis from which time proceeds, and which it returns; and the earth reposes in heaven by which it is surrounded and pervaded. For eternity and heaven are the forms of existence for perfect life, for the world of ideas, and for the corresponding realities. Inasmuch as every creature contains within itself the idea of its being, which idea, as its true life, belongs to heaven and to eternity, it follows that time is wholly borne by eternity, and earth surrounded and controlled by heaven. And accordingly, in the case of any creature, the more fully the earthly reality and its idea have become one, the more fully does it partake of eternal life, even whilst it stands empirically in time.† And he whose spirit lives in perfect harmony with the idea of his being, has eternity already dwelling in him with all its fulness, and carries heaven with all its glory hidden, though it be essentially (not in an abstractly ideal manner), in himself, although it does not enter empirically into his earthly consciousness. If now we apply this knowledge to the incarnate Son of God, we can understand how His divine form of existence, although completely laid aside during His abode on earth as man, neither ceased to exist in general, nor yet existed outside

* John 1:51.

† John 3:36. John 5:13.

of His earthly person either in time or space. We see rather that His eternal glory in heaven and His temporal form of a servant, His dwelling in heaven, and His walk upon earth, His demiurgic government in the Spirit, and His redemptive activity in the flesh belong equally to Him, to His single person.

This immanence is confirmed also by the declaration of Jesus Himself. For when He gives utterance to His personal feelings, He speaks of a glory which He *had* with the Father, and which the Father *will give* Him again*; but on the other hand when He speaks as a teacher, and not from His immediate consciousness, He refers very distinctly to a presence and immanence of His being and power in His person; as for example when He declares to Nicodemus†: "No man hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven;" and when He testifies to the Jews‡: "Before Abraham was (not I was, but) I AM;" so also when John says§: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." These expressions are true and intelligible in the light of the assumption that the Son of God, although He truly entered into time and became incarnate on earth, yet ceased not to dwell internally in heaven, and with the Father and the Holy Ghost to govern heaven and earth.

On the other hand, however, the truth of His self-abnegation, whereby for our sakes He became poor, is not destroyed by this assumption. For the Son of God indeed entered into the misery of the flesh, and lived thirty years in it, even in the deepest experience of sorrow and death; and during the time of His earthly career, His heavenly glory was for Him not something present which He possessed and enjoyed in secret, but something that lay beyond the limits of His earthly life, something that He had left behind and was only to receive again from the Father. It is just in this that we recognize

* John 17: 5; 16: 23.

† John 8: 58.

‡ John 3: 13.

§ John 1: 18. Comp. 6: 46.

the prototypal actualization of that double life, which love always lives, in which every true Christian imitates his Lord, when with heartfelt sympathy he enters into the misery of his suffering brother without losing or sacrificing peace with God in his soul. This peace with God is rather the fountain from which he derives strength to become poor for the poor, and to suffer with the suffering.

We must therefore assume in the person of Jesus a real self-abnegation (*ξένωσις*) of the Son of God, whilst yet He eternally retains the possession (*κτησις*) and use (*χρησις*) of His divine glory. There was a concealment (*κρυψις*) of this possession and use only in an objective sense in virtue of the concealed immanence of the eternal in the temporal, of the heavenly in the earthly; on the other hand in a subjective sense as a concealing or veiling in the sense of the old dogmatists, it would injure the pure image of His humanity, as well as by necessary consequence that of His divinity itself. There is accordingly no need of that unnatural, violent course which the later doctrine of the *kenosis* has taken, in order to set aside what is certainly one-sided and disproportionate in the old church doctrine. This is accomplished without departing from the earlier Church development of this doctrine, simply by limiting the subjective union of the two natures and modes of existence, the divine and the human, in the God-man, as well as the communication of the attributes of the divine to the human (*communicatio idiomatum*), to the state of exaltation; and on the other hand, assuming for the state of humiliation, a relative, subjective separation of the divine and the human modes of existence, not in such a way, however, that the *objective immanence* of the two is thereby excluded, or the unity of the person itself destroyed.

This mode of explanation has indeed been reproached as a speculation which prevents the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures. But in this charge the fact is entirely overlooked that the position and aim of science are altogether different from those of the biblical authors. The Scriptures appeal in their language to the popular consciousness, and hence immediately to human

conception which sees the eternal in the form of the temporal. Science, however, rising from mere conception to pure thought, endeavors to distinguish the eternal from the temporal, and to apprehend it in its own essential nature. Mere reflection is incapable of doing this, speculative thought is necessary for its accomplishment, and theology can never dispense with speculation if it is to solve its problem; for the Scriptures, whenever they speak of heaven, eternal life, the spiritual glory, etc., move in a sphere which transcends the natural order. Instead, therefore, of perverting the words of Scripture, we, in this way, rather bring out their true meaning, whilst on the other hand, mere reflection, by cleaving externally to the literal conception, changes the eternal into the temporal, the heavenly into the finite, the divine into the human.

Thus we obtain a *unique image of the God-man*, when in contemplating the mystery of the incarnation we proceed from the stand-point of the *eternal Son*, who became man. We encounter the same unique image of the God-man when we occupy the stand-point of His *humanity in Jesus*. Here again we are not confronted by a double personality, but by one truly unique. It is only necessary clearly to apprehend and exhibit partly the manner in which the divine and the human are one in the person of Jesus, and partly the stages of development through which this union moves.

So far as the former is concerned, our safest course is to consider the manner in which universally the divine is by nature immanent in the being of man. By nature, the Spirit from God, through whom we were created, dwells in us, for nothing can subsist except through the immanence of the power by which it was made to exist. This Spirit from God in us involves already the original type of the God-man, inasmuch as communion with God, for which we are appointed in virtue of our likeness to God, is essentially mediated by the God-man. But this Spirit is not our *ego* itself, which thinks, feels and wills; He is rather the divine principle which enables

us to think, feel and will in a human way. As He is the power of God in us, through which we are and subsist, so in Him we at the same time bear in us God's eternal ideal image of our nature, and the demands of His will in respect to our moral development. This Spirit from God in us, which we must apprehend as the union of the idea, will and power of God, accordingly forms in us the objective substratum on which our nature, with its development rests. Precisely now, as in creation, the Spirit of God in us became the substratum of our nature, in order that we might *truly become man*, so also the Son of God when He assumed human nature, made His divine being the substratum of His humanity in order that He might become *God-man*. Whilst our true human nature consists in this, that we have been thought, willed, and created men by God, and bear this divine idea, will, and power in our nature as its substratum, this indeed is also not wanting in the human nature of Jesus, since without this He would not be a true, full man. But He has at the same time still another substratum of His earthly nature, in virtue of which He, in distinction from us, is the God-man. It is this: The nature of the eternal Son of God has in His generation by the Holy Ghost, incorporated itself into His human nature (which by His self-abnegation came into earthly existence) as the objective principle of His being and forms the fundamental support of His earthly existence, the immanent authority of His development in time. And just as that Spirit from God, which is immanent in us by nature, is eternal, and thus capable of being the true power and unchangeable authority for our development in time, so also is that objective immanence of the divine nature of the Son in Jesus, a life belonging essentially to eternity, but implanted into the temporal humanity of Jesus as its life principle in order to serve an immanent power and authority for all stages of its earthly development, through which, like us, it must necessarily pass.

Yet this distinction between the principle of the human development of Jesus, and His divine-human development, must not be understood as if there were a division of the prin-

ciples of His life. The two are rather in essential union with each other. For the divine nature of the Son has become the substratum of the person of Jesus, only to realize now in created form and in time the image of His divine prototypal nature for which man was created, but which he as a sinner could not and cannot realize. And on the other hand, the Spirit of God which is in Jesus by nature, and in which as man He bears the idea of His nature in Himself, forms the natural bearer of the immanence of the Logos ; so that the two in their union constitute the proper divine human principle in Jesus. This immanence of the Logos nature exerted its influence on the divine human development in Jesus, just as the immanence of the Spirit of God, which is in us by nature, exerts its influence upon the human development of all the children of men, and was in this way subject also to the same laws to which human life universally is subject for its development in time.

Jesus was not conscious of Himself only as man, as we all are ; but beyond this, and especially as the one in whom the eternal Son of God humbled Himself in time and in human form ; He was conscious that in His personality He was identical with the Son of God, as is evident from His testimony concerning Himself, referred to above. Yet this consciousness of identity existed in Him in an earthly manner. The immanence of His divine nature was for Him a merely ideal power, precisely as the immanence of the divine idea of our nature which we carry in our spirit is for us. On the other hand, the reality of His divine life was for Him something that lay outside of His earthly existence. And even this is in analogy with our universal human self-consciousness ; for whilst the divine idea of our nature, which idea is something eternal, even forms the immanent substratum of our earthly reality, and can even be elevated (in faith) so as to become the free principle of our personal development, and can implant itself vitally into our inmost being, the reality of our eternal life itself is for our consciousness something that lies purely beyond the horizon of our present existence.

As now the identity with the eternal Logos-ego in this way continued to exist in the man Jesus on the one hand, but was modified for His consciousness in an earthly manner on the other hand, so also can we say the same of the *relation which subsists reciprocally in the trinity between the Son and the Father and the Holy Ghost*, a relation which is immediately invoked in His divine nature. This relation also was not interrupted by His entrance into temporal life; it formed rather the essential, living, fundamental power of His theanthropic existence and activity on earth. But it was modified for His human consciousness on earth in an earthly manner; for He now felt Himself placed *as a human ego* into this trinitarian communion, and hence this communion assumed for Him at the same time a character of *dependence such as the creature always feels towards the Creator*. He felt therefore that He had been sent into this world by the Father, to accomplish the Father's work in the world; He felt that He was in this respect subject to the Father, as His God and Lord, as He said of the Father: "The Father is greater than I." It was necessary for Him to strengthen Himself continually for the accomplishing of the work allotted to Him, to seek the face of His heavenly Father in prayer and to derive encouragement and refreshment from the approbation of His Father in the toils, conflicts, and sufferings of His earthly vocation. In the same way also the Holy Ghost formed on earth the internal bond by which the communion of the Son with the Father in heaven was mediated. Whilst the Holy Spirit was active in the generation of the Son in the flesh only as the creative principle, to mediate His entrance into the world, this same Spirit descended at His baptism upon His person and into the depths of His being, in order to prepare Him with divine power for the accomplishment of His divine-human work on earth. He (the Spirit) communicated to Him not only special gifts as in the case of chosen men under the old dispensation. He descended upon Him in His own essence (as is shown in the symbol of the descending dove), thus filling Him with the entire fullness of His gifts,* and continued to

* John iii. 34.

dwell personally in Him, in order that after the work of the Son was accomplished, He might be poured out from the Son upon the whole human race, so that it might be glorified in the image of the Son.

When the Son of God became man, therefore, He did not withdraw from the communion of trinitarian life; but He stood in this communion with *human* consciousness. But this could come to pass only by receiving as the animating principle of His earthly life the same disposition which prevails eternally in the holy trinity, and which also induced the Son to become incarnate, namely that of LOVE. The eternal, divine love of the Son was continued in Jesus as earthly-human love, springing with just as much necessity as freedom from His human soul, and revealing its life (also according to its essential nature) *in holy receptivity and spontaneity*. From the first moment of awaking consciousness, and thence throughout His entire life on earth, Jesus, with full freedom and truth of the human soul, kept His will open to the influence of the divine direction, which, coming partly from the depths of His own inner life, and partly from revelations continually received from above, strengthened His heart in the work of love which He had undertaken. Holy humility thus forms the fundamental characteristic in the life of the lowly Son of God.* But at the same time, whilst His entire human being was thus filled with divine powers of life, love became in Him an independent fountain of life, which streamed forth from His soul with divine-human power in the interest of His redemptive mission upon everything that approached it. And in the strength and purity of this love we find the archetypal majesty and greatness of His humanity, to which His humility serves as a vail.

But the direction of His love was twofold. Above all there dwelt in His heart love to His Father in heaven. To His Father's word He gave heed in all things, to do His will was His meat and drink, in prayer to Him He obtained strength and confidence in the temptations and difficulties of His work, and in the approbation of His Father He found peace.

* Matt. xi. 29.

On the other hand His love was directed toward the world, and the former (love to His Father) manifested and approved itself in the latter. Proceeding from the nearest, narrowest circle, the family, it passed over to His nation, the Israel chosen of God, to which He naturally belonged, and thence it enlarged to compass entire humanity, called to membership in the kingdom. Furthermore His love was sympathetic. The misery of our earthly life with all its frailties went to His heart, wherever it confronted Him. But above all, was it the fountain of all this misery, sin, that wakened the pain of His love, and both excited His holy wrath against the prince of this world and the children of wickedness, and called forth His pity for the poor, misled souls, that sat in the shadow and darkness of death.

And this love never rested. It continually flowed over as in the words of doctrine, the announcement of and invitation to the kingdom of God, so also in helping deeds, healing the sick and raising the dead. Yea, when it entered upon the conflict with the powers of falsehood and wickedness, it did not even fear persecution, and continued its work under the heaviest suffering until it was sealed with its death upon the cross.

In this way love formed in the deepest and most comprehensive sense the animating principle in the life of the Son of God in the state of His humiliation. And through this love, which kept Him in uninterrupted communication with the Father, the light of divine truth fell unbroken into the depths of His Spirit, from which He received strength and joyfulness of mind and will so as to hold fast to the word and will of His Father in all temptations, and faithfully to accomplish the work committed to Him. Thus His love, in which His eternal divine love was continued and worked out as human, became the light and the life of the world.

The consciousness of Jesus that He was the Son of God, and the revelation of His redeeming love in a holy walk must, however, not be regarded as something finished from the beginning. For when we read that He increased, as in stature, so in wis-

dom and in favor with God and man,* and that, although He was the Son of God, He learned obedience by the things which He suffered,† this gradual development is to be applied also to that relation of His eternal sonship which constituted His human personality. Yea, growth in this respect is essentially the source of His growth in all wisdom, holiness, and righteousness. This growth, however, is not to be understood as if we could conceive of any period of His life, in which the union of His human with His divine life had not as yet actually existed. The development of His God-consciousness kept pace with that of His natural self-consciousness, and His communion of love with the Father kept pace with the awaking of His moral powers, so that there was no moment of His life on earth which was not determined by the union of His human personality with the immanent, divine basis of His life.

Furthermore this development is not to be regarded as conditioned from one side only, either the divine or the human. It would be a magical conception of the life of Jesus, if we were to suppose that all progress in the same was the simple result of an immediate influence from the divine side of His nature. The truth is, such an influence could accomplish any result only in that Jesus with the full freedom of human self-determination obeyed the internal impulse. Just as little dare we assume that the divine in Him was entirely quiescent, and look for the starting point of all progress in His development exclusively in His own internal choice. We must assume much rather a living, mutual co-operation of these two factors in the life of Jesus. Every internal life-movement of His divine-human personality had its ultimate ground in an internal revelation of the divine, which formed the life-basis of His personality, and which exerted a quickening influence upon His human soul and will; and such a movement was actualized when He with human soul and conscious will obeyed this internal impulse, held it fast, and executed it without wavering. But every stage of internal growth thus accomplished made room for the immanent

* Luke ii. 52.

† Heb. v. 8.

divine impulse, to reveal itself with increased power to His human spirit, and thus to bring to pass a still higher stage of growth. And thus there was continually accomplished a more free and full interpretation and intercommunion of life between the divine and the human in Jesus, until the union which was principally established in the beginning obtained its full, historical actualization in the life of Jesus.

It is involved in the very nature of the case, that in its beginning, when the personal life as yet lay concealed in the predominant natural life, the humanity of Jesus was as yet purely passive to the influence of its immanent divine factor. This appears to be indicated in the Scriptures by the fact that in order to designate, in the early stages of the life of Jesus, His (in virtue of generation by the Holy Ghost sinless) humanity, the neuter term "that holy thing,"* is at first chosen. Afterward in the progress of the childhood of Jesus, mere passivity becomes free receptivity, and when He arrives at mature age it passes over into reacting spontaneity. To this the twofold account refers which St. Luke gives of the development of the childhood of Jesus. Upon the return of Jesus out of Egypt to Nazareth during the first years of His life we are told: "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon Him,"† where the waxing strong in spirit, forms the spiritual parallel to the development of His bodily nature, being filled with wisdom represents something that happened to Him rather than through Him, and where the grace of God is only said to be upon Him, since grace in men is called forth more definitely only through the free development of natural talents and the formation of character. On the other hand in that part of the biblical narrative in which a comprehensive view is cast upon the progressive development of His youth and early manhood comprehending the period which intervened between His visit to Jerusalem in His twelfth year, and the time when He entered upon His public Messianic work, in His thirtieth year, we have to do with a real progress in

* Luke i. 35.

† Luke ii. 40.

wisdom (which on account of its personal character is even placed before the parallel development of His physical nature), and in addition to favor with God we find also favor with men.*

In His twelfth year, Jesus already stood in conscious union with His Father in heaven, as appears from His answer to His parents: "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" He was partly led to this by the special guidance which He experienced in a moral way, and partly confirmed in it by His growing insight into God's revelations in the Old Testament, which He attained by earnest inquiry into Holy Scripture, and by surrendering Himself in love to His nation. But that a sanctifying power was poured into His entire personality from this communion with His Father in the love of filial obedience, a power which impressed upon His childhood the character of actual innocence and upon His youth that of sinless purity and spotless virtue so as to make a shining example of human development—all this we learn from the conduct of John the Baptist at His baptism. For even before the Holy Ghost was poured out upon Him whereby John received the revelation concerning the divine mission and destination of Jesus to baptize the world with the Holy Ghost, he had already refused to perform for Jesus the symbolical act of purification from sins, and declared that he had need rather to be baptized by Jesus. This is a proof that he had received from the person of Jesus, whom, no doubt, he knew according to the flesh (although not yet according to the Spirit,)[†] as we may infer from the close connection between related Israelite families, the impression of perfect moral purity. And even the spiritualizing effect of special communion with His Father was not wanting upon the life of His inner nature. For the fact that His mother, at the marriage of Cana, so decidedly expressed the expectation that He would supply the deficiency of wine which they experienced, seems to indicate that Jesus had even before this given proof of the miraculous powers which He possessed.

His public entrance upon His Messianic office was decisive for

* Luke ii. 52.

† John i. 33.

the development of His divine-human life. He who was sinlessly pure submitted Himself in holy humility to the baptism of John in the feeling of fellowship with our sinful race. Then occurred the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Him, and the word of the Father came from heaven, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Thus His special divine sonship was witnessed and confirmed in a solemn manner. And in virtue of this perfectly clear conception of the extraordinary position which He assumed among the children of men, and toward God as His Father,* He knew also the special work which He had to accomplish for the world, the vocation to become the Messiah of His people, the Redeemer of the world. Whilst He was hitherto conscious primarily of His special divine sonship, He now became more distinctly conscious also through the internal testimony of the Holy Ghost, of His *special office and vocation* in this world. And if already in His twelfth year communion with His heavenly Father and obedience toward Him, were more important for Him than obedience toward His earthly parents, now all earthly and human relations retire into the background in comparison with this one thing, namely, to do the will of His Father, and to redeem humanity from the power of the devil.† Led by the Spirit into the wilderness He laid the foundation of His redemptive activity, by repelling with holy decision, referring each time to the Word of God, the temptations of Satan who by presenting to His mind the picture of false Messiahship out of Messianic pleasure, honor and dominion, sought to draw Him away from His holy vocation and to win Him to his service. And afterward He entered upon His office in preaching the kingdom of God and His righteousness, confirming the same by manifestations of saving love, by healing the sick and raising the dead. Another epoch of His divine-human life presents itself to our view in the fact that Jesus directed His mind and soul upon the suffering of death which He had to endure in order to redeem humanity, and that He assumed this most difficult part of His earthly vocation with

* John v. 17-18.

† Matt. xii. 47-50.

full internal freedom, as is proved by the fact that He distinctly and repeatedly foretold such sufferings.* By this means His internal glorification, the power of which had already streamed forth in His miracles, entered upon the last stage of its accomplishment, which was revealed in that transient transfiguration of even His body on the mountain. And this highest manifestation of the obedience of the love towards His Father was also confirmed before the disciples by the testimony of the Father: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye Him."†

But the union of the Son in His state of humility with the Father in heaven attained its real completion in this, that the Son held fast this determination of His love in obedience toward the Father for the redemption of sinful humanity even in His suffering, and executed it even to His death on the cross. He expressed this after His entrance into Jerusalem by which He was delivered into the hands of His enemies when He said: "The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified;"‡ and on the last evening when Judas went out to execute his work of betrayal, Jesus announced the completion of His internal glorification thus brought to pass, by saying further: "Now is the Son of man glorified."§ But the power of this internal glorification, He revealed in this, that in the Holy Supper which He instituted as the memorial of His suffering, He fed the disciples with His body which He was now prepared to offer in death for us, and gave them His blood to drink which He was now about to shed for the remission of our sins.||

With His death itself the work of His love was accomplished, and He could now commend His spirit into the hands of His Father to whom He was obedient even unto death. But the Father testified that the Son in His earthly humanity also maintained the union in which He stood with the Father from all eternity, and therefore He did not leave Him in the bonds of death, but raised Him up again on the third day so that He

* Matt. xvi. 21, comp. Matt. xvii. † Matt. xvii. 1-9.

‡ John xii. 23. § John xiii. 31, 32. || Compare the author: "über das heilige Abend mahl nach Lehre und Uebung," 1869, p. 18.

came forth from the grave in a glorified body, and afterward ascended into Heaven, to sit henceforth as the Son of man on the right hand of the Father. Although He arose, according to the spirit of holiness,* that is on this basis, that in Himself He made the spirit the principle of His life, the Father, who had sent Him for the redemption of humanity into this world of flesh, now also introduced this power of the Spirit into His external nature, which as yet held in the flesh, in order that His body might be spiritualized and glorified,† and His person in its totality be thus carried from the state of humiliation over into the state of glorification. This was the reward of His obedience even unto the death of the cross.‡

Thus the union of the human nature assumed by the Son, with His divine nature, a union grounded from all eternity in the triune love, passed through all the stages of development in time from birth to death, inasmuch as it was first established according to nature, taken up into His personal life with increasing clearness and freedom in virtue of His communion in love with His heavenly Father and the power of the Holy Ghost who dwelt within Him, maintained and approved by the faithful, obedient fulfilling of His redemptive mission in testifying of the kingdom of God and a holy walk, and perfected in self-sacrificing love by His atoning suffering and death. And the Father sealed it in the resurrection and exaltation of the Son to His right hand in heaven.

At His exaltation Jesus entered upon a new form of existence; from that of the flesh, He passed into that of the *Spirit*. If up to this point only His internal man was spiritualized by love, now His external man, also His entire bodily nature, was penetrated and permeated by the power of the Spirit. And this spiritualization of His body cast its reflection back again into the life of His soul, so that His entire human nature now was wholly glorified. Jesus Christ is in His exaltation spirit, spirit in the centrality of spiritual personality and in the fullness of spiritual nature and corporeity.

* Rom. i. 4. † Rom. vi. 4, 8, 11; Acts ii. 32. ‡ Phil. ii. 9, 10.

Yea, inasmuch as this spiritualization and glorification has been accomplished in an absolute manner in Jesus, and inasmuch as it exists for humanity principally and in a prototypal manner in Him, He is immediately called *the Spirit** in Sacred Scripture.

In so far now as the humanity of Jesus in its totality belongs herewith to the life of perfection, it is evident that it can henceforth no longer stand in the life-form which is subject to development in the flesh, in time and finite space, but must have entered that form of life, which answers to the state of perfection, out of time into *eternity*, from this earth into *heaven*, Jesus did indeed not herewith give up His relation to this temporal world, but as God, though standing above time and space, yet all-efficaciously pervades time and space to uphold them in their natural existence, so also does the exalted Son of man forever work into this world with the power of His heavenly eternal life to fill it with a Spiritual life. Immediately after His resurrection already He revealed Himself repeatedly to His disciples in personal appearance, to teach them what they could not have borne hitherto, and to comfort them through the assurance of His indissoluble life. And having ascended into heaven, He now from on high guides His Church even to the end of the world, in that He through the Holy Ghost teaches and instructs her, by His glorified body (*Leiblichkeit*) feeds and nourishes her, and through His personal presence and indwelling keeps her in the true faith in all her temptations. But His life itself He henceforth no longer lives in the limits of space and time. His glorified humanity rather sits enthroned now eternally in heaven, where separation and distance no longer exist, but where His love fills all things in the power of the Spirit; He lives now as Son of Man in eternity, into which no imperfection nor any suffering extends, in which also nothing passes away nor decays, but in which everything exists in the pure presence of perfection and in the pure unfolding and revelation of His inner glory.

* 2 Cor. iii. 17.

Since, however, the humanity of Jesus has thus passed over into the same life of the Spirit and of glory and into the same form of existence of heaven and eternity, in which the divine life of the eternal Logos holds, it is evident that the relative separation can henceforth no longer continue, which had hitherto existed between the divine and human natures of the Son, inasmuch as the former belonged to the eternity of heaven, the latter to the temporality of earth. The Son of God lives now, as with His divine consciousness and will, so also with the consciousness and will of His human nature, in the perfection of heavenly, eternal life. The two circles of the divine and human natures around the one centre of the person of the Son of God, which we above saw divided in the two spheres of heaven and earth, of time and eternity, fall together now in the one common sphere of heaven and eternity. And in this way now the inner unity, which during the state of humiliation as to both these sides had been, though not interrupted, yet circumscribed and hemmed in in the *ego* of the Son of God, can freely reveal and unfold itself also in His outer form of existence. In His earthly humanity the Son of God had carried in Himself His eternal Logos existence only in an objective manner, as an immanent divine life-basis and as a divine authority for His human development. But, as His humanity has passed over into the life of the Spirit, His human consciousness can now also enter into the *subjective unity* with His divine consciousness, so that the consciousness of the exalted Son of Man becomes the consciousness of the Logos and *vice versa*. And as the glory of His Logos existence was for Him here below only something that lay in the past and future, so it has become for Him now an ever present reality, into the possession and enjoyment of which He herewith enters and forever remains therein.

The union presents itself to us in the same way, if we view it from the stand-point of the divine nature of the Son of God. The human nature of the Son of God, which in an ideal manner is eternally taken up by Him into the unity of His divine Being on the basis of the eternal counsel of the divine, triune love He has led forth out of its eternal ideality into its earthly

reality, in order that He might in time work out its holy life, in act and suffering for the salvation of the world. Now, however, His humanity with the prize of its earthly work returns back again into eternity, forever to remain there.

And on this basis the Son of God now bears, in the fulness of its perfect reality, His human nature which existed in Him from all eternity in ideal union with His divine nature. His divine self-consciousness is become one with the consciousness of His human mode of existence in time, with His self-consciousness as the man, Jesus, who now sits as the Son of God forever at the right hand of the Father.

Whilst, therefore, in order to comprehend the theanthropism of Jesus in His state of humiliation, we had to represent it from two different points of observation, from His earthly human, since the Son of God lived on earth as the man, Jesus, and from the eternal divine, since the Son of God in communion with the Father and the Holy Ghost, eternally rules heaven and earth, whereby arose the appearance (though only the appearance) of a double personality; now in His exaltation this appearance vanishes away; for the Son of God lives now in heaven at the right hand of the Father as the God-man, and His consciousness willing and working is a heavenly eternal one, as that of the Son of God who is both God and man in one person.

To enable us to understand more clearly how in the transition of Jesus from His state of humiliation into His exaltation and the change connected therewith in the relation of His human self-consciousness to His nature as Logos, let us take as an analogy (which, however, is no more than this) the transition of our self-consciousness from the sleeping and dreaming into the watching state. Our *ego* is the same in sleep and waking. But in sleep our real self-consciousness is driven back into latency and furnishes only the inner ground for that consciousness which moves in a different inner world. When on the contrary we awake out of sleep, we return, as to our real world, so to our true self-consciousness. But our *ego* itself has not thereby been changed. The transition into another world had only this object in view, to refresh our powers for activity

in our real world. Thus this earthly mortal-life which the Son of God lived with us to His actual death, was for Him a pilgrimage into a strange and distant land. His self-consciousness *per se*, His *ego* itself, remained unchanged, but His true inner and outer world, the communion and glory of the eternal triune life, had become for Him something that lay beyond. But when He was now awakened again from death by the Father, into whose hands He had committed His Spirit in death, He awoke again to His true, full, divine-eternal self-consciousness. He was and felt Himself at home in His heavenly abode. On the other hand, His earthly life had in this way become for Him something that lay in the past. Only the significance of reward for His exaltation and the acquisition of redemption for humanity, He had taken with Him to the other side, but His *ego* itself, although in the transition from the eternal ideality through the earthly reality into the heavenly ideal-reality, it remained unchanged by the same, had only now again come into His real internal and external world.

At the same time by means of this union of the divine and the human consciousness in the exalted Son of Man, there is confirmed and strengthened in its true light the relation between time and eternity (as well as between heaven and earth) —a relation which manifests itself already in the natural working of God, or just as much one of the independence of eternity from time and the dependence of time on eternity as also one of living reciprocal action between the two. For although the humanity of the Son of God starting from its eternal ideality has made its course through temporal reality to heavenly ideal-reality, still the eternity of His divine self-consciousness, which included in His life from all eternity His relation to humanity, and in this way also His human consciousness, was not thereby interrupted. The reason of this is that although eternity consists in an uninterrupted unfolding which has its own law of life, it makes no room for development, such as exists in time, and, therefore, He could not live through one in a manner parallel with the other. But, on the other hand, the incarnation of the Son of God in time, would have been altogether

impossible, if it would not have had its causative ground (principle) in the eternal decree of love for the union, *i. e.* reunion of humanity with God in the Son, and so again His eternal humanity became truly perfect and quickening only in its actualization in time.

If, however, this heavenly-eternal union of the divine and human nature in the Person of Christ shall be recognized by us in its true living character, we must have regard at the same time to the *mutual interpenetration* which exists in this nature between the divine and human life of Christ Jesus, the exalted Son of God and man.

And here the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* as held by the Lutheran Church, whose application to the earthly, temporal life of Jesus we were obliged already to resist, comes to its just rights and its full meaning, although even here it can be understood and honored only upon the ground, that the human nature which Christ assumed in time stood from all eternity in its ideal essence already in union with His divine nature.

The *effect of the divine nature of the God-man upon His human nature* is one side of this mutual penetration of natures. A certain participation in the divine nature is promised, it is true, to men generally upon the ground of our redemption through Christ; he that by faith in divine grace becomes a member of the body of Christ, who had already been foreordained as the first born of every creature to become the principle of our communion with God, and had become the first-born from the dead for their redemption, shall through Him become partaker of the divine nature.* Still, although this is not to be understood in a figurative nor in a mere moral sense, but as a real union of our personality with God in Christ, the influence of the divine upon our human nature, in consequence of that state of independence in which the divine personality must forever stand to the human, cannot lift this latter above the limits of that power and glory, to which our nature in itself was limited from the creation onwards.

But we must admit of a still higher measure of influence upon

* 2 Pet. i. 4. Compare also 1 John iii. 2.

the human nature of Christ, because in this case no separation between personalities takes place, but a union of two natures in one person. We may learn how to understand this from the influence, which the body receives from the soul, with which it stands united in one personal life; not merely does the soul breathe life into the body, but it expresses also its internal activities in the countenance, features and gestures of the body, and by means of it all its own internal motions have free play for inward activity. So now in like manner Christ's human nature and form of existence, by virtue of the union aforesaid in His one person, must also partake in the powers of His divine nature and form of existence. Whilst then certainly our nature when once in a state of glorification can no longer be bound to the limits of space or to the limitations of the flesh, but is capacitated by the power of the Spirit there to be and there to work, where the internal attraction of love draws it; yet nevertheless Jesus after His resurrection did not give His disciples merely the promise, Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,* but He also testifies concerning Himself, likewise thus: All power is given unto me in heaven and upon earth.† And this applies in the unqualified sense in which it is said. As human nature by virtue of its being fully in the image of the divine is enabled to pursue its destiny, so the humanity of Christ continually participates in the power and glory which He as the Son of God possesses in consequence of His divine nature. Not only as the Logos, but also as the man Jesus, He is the Lord, ‡ who rules over all, § and to whom the angels are in subjection.|| Not only with His eternal Spirit, but also with His glorified body, He can be everywhere present and communicate Himself to whomsoever He will: not only with divine power does He govern heaven and earth, but the work is also carried forward by the powers of His human nature.¶ And Jesus was therefore from the resurrection inwards worshiped, ** prayed to †† and directly adored as "God over all." ‡‡

* Matt. xxviii. 20. † xxviii. 18. ‡ Acts ii. 36. § Heb. i. 8; John xvii. 5, 24. || 1 Peter v. 22. ¶ Matt. xxviii. 18. ** John xx. 28; Phil. ii. 10. †† 1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 13. ‡‡ Rom. ix. 5, compare also Revelation.

And yet, although according to this the Son of God enjoys divine power and honor also according to His human form of existence, still this elevation of the human into the divine nature must not be conceived of as a change into the divine nature, not as a deification. Rather, as the body, although in personal union with the soul it takes part in all its activities, and thereby becomes vital, spiritual and also psychic in character, without changing itself into a psychic existence, remains forever body, and acts only as a conditioned organ in the service of the Lord, whilst its vital power goes forth from the soul, so the humanity of Jesus, notwithstanding its participation in the divine government and working of the Son of God, nevertheless continues forever within the limitations of a human existence. For, as in its glorification, it serves the Son of God as an all penetrating, an always willing organ, so it never exists nor works with creature and conditioned power and glory, but only as a creature subject to conditions.

Thus the above-mentioned law of love, which, with entire self-devotion in the union, nevertheless maintains throughout self-preservation, requires and realizes this as an actual result, to wit, that the union should not be reduced to an outward mixture or mere mechanical union, but should become a real unity.

The exaltation of Jesus, accordingly, is not limited to a mere spiritualization and glorification of His human nature, which was especially the case in His resurrection, but is expanded in consequence of His entrance into heaven into an actual oneness with the Godhead, that is, into such an interpenetration with the powers of His divine nature, and into such an illumination by its divine glory, that it remains forever under its power and lustre.

But then inasmuch as the Divine nature of Christ, with its living powers, works over upon His human nature, the union can be maintained as a real unity only as a corresponding *influence of the human upon the divine* is at the same time admitted. This, of course, must not be so regarded, as if by this means the divine nature experienced any limitation of its

power and glory. Such a supposition is opposed to the very nature of the absolute. But this latter does nevertheless lay itself open to such an influence in so far as it henceforth lives not for itself, but in loving devotion to the human nature, which He has determined to take up into complete communion with Himself. This decree was fulfilled ideally, as we have seen, already in eternity by the eternal incarnation of the Son, and also when by virtue of this decree He actually appeared on the earth, in the flesh, by taking upon Himself our human nature; whilst at the same time, the Father was well pleased with Him, the Son of man, and through Him, with humanity; so it becomes clearly manifest, how God continues His eternal, trinitarian life, not in Himself, but through His Son, in and with the creature formed in His image. But this love union of God with humanity in His beloved Son, came to its completion for the first time in His elevation to a seat at the right hand of the throne in heaven. Inasmuch as the Son of God lives no longer as mere God, but also as man in the communion of His Father in heaven, so also must His humanity, although under the limitation of a creature, take part in the threefold activity of God. But just by this means has this latter acquired a new significance and new life-contents. For as Christ has gone into the heavens, He has taken with Him there the entire fruit of His life in the flesh, and of His holy death for mankind at large; and resting on this, as its ground, His mediatorial activity, whereby He again reconciled to God our fallen humanity; unites itself with his demiurgic activity, by which He governs heaven and earth. His natural creative energy has in this way been enlarged into a spiritual one, and not the reverse; for this latter continues without interruption in eternity, and His government of the world becomes a restoration and a completion of the kingdom of God. And this indicates an essentially higher development of the activity of His life, as it also brings with it a higher stadium for the life of humanity and of the world.

During the servant-form of His life on earth there was in connection with the relative separation of the two forms of His

existence, likewise a relative separation or division in His twofold activity. His mere demiurgic work had indeed preserved the natural stability of the world, but He must leave the power of sin, which had been brought in, to continue unresolved. On the other hand, in His state of humiliation, He had, it is true, borne our misery with us and for us, but He was not able at once to apply to us the blessing of this His compassionate love; because for this purpose a divinely conditional power was requisite, which, as mere man, He did not possess. But now since the Son of God by virtue of His exaltation, has united His activity in heaven as the Son of God and as the Son of Man, the creative energies of his Logos-existence within the sphere of His mediatory work as the Son of Man pass over into a real new creation of humanity on the one hand, and on the other, the mediatory powers of His humanity unite with His demiurgic activities as the Son of God in the spiritualizing of nature, in a real glorification of the world.

It is clear how in this way the union of God and man in Jesus Christ is brought about. His self-consciousness as the God-Man is one that is no longer divided by the limits of time and space, but one that exists in pure unity. His love gushes forth at the same time from a divine and human heart, and all His life-powers and attributes bear a pure divine-human character. In this union of both forms of life He is truly our high priest and shepherd, the Lord who will judge the world at the time appointed, the head of His Church, which he will perfect in His kingdom.* As the God-man Himself He verily stands in the life-circle of the divine trinity;† the life which He had from all eternity from the Father, He receives also as man, and the Holy Ghost, who goeth forth from Him eternally as the Son, proceedeth no less from Him as the Son of Man;* the love itself, with which the Father eternally loves the Son, applies in the same degree to His humanity; and so also He loves the Father in the unity of the Holy Ghost, re-

* Eph. i. 22, 23. Acts iii. 19, 21.

† Col. ii. 9.

turning His love from a human as well as a divine heart and fulfilling His will in His kingdom with human as well as divine powers.

In this eternal, heavenly theanthropism of the Son, *the mystery of love* has then also completed itself. That perfect union and unity, which is the end of love and which, whilst it holds within the limits of self-protection, and is reached in the way of perfect self-devotion by mutual participation and communication, is here truly and absolutely realized between God and humanity as well as the creation generally. What the divine love willed from eternity, and is the ground and end of the creation, that is here in principle fulfilled for all eternity. The God-man is the personal life centre of the kingdom of God, in which His love is spread abroad in its entire fulness and glory. From Him proceeds all the love, which in this kingdom unites God with his creature, the creature with God, and all creatures with one another; from Him go forth the powers of the Spirit, which spiritually renews the world, brings it into perfect harmony of life and completes its inward and outward glory; and from Him flows forth into the creation the divine life, so as to unite it with God in a glorified state.* In him eternity becomes one with time, and time is taken up in eternity. In him heaven has come down upon the earth, and the earth is elevated into an heavenly existence; He is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, He that is and that was and that is to come, the Almighty,† whose are the kingdoms of the world, and who shall reign from everlasting to everlasting.‡ Amen.

* John xiv. 16.

† Rev. i. 8.

‡ Rev. xi. 15.

ART. VIII.—THE PRESBYTERIAN THEORY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

IN the October number of the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*, there is an article on Infant Baptism which professes to set forth the Presbyterian theory on this subject, and it is endorsed as such by the editors of the *Review* in the following words: "We are quite clear that the main positions taken by Mr. White" (the author of the article), "are in accord with our standards, when their meaning is fairly elicited by a comparison of their various parts, and that these in turn are in accord with the Scriptures."

We will first give the theory and then make some criticisms upon it.

1. Baptism is the *official initiatory rite* of the visible Church. This is the first point. The writer distinguishes this character of the sacrament from (a) that public confession of Christ before men that our Lord so pointedly commands, and (b) from the "door," which he erroneously makes synonymous with *entering* the Church.

2. Baptism symbolizes, and thus has implied reference to, that radical change in the soul that we commonly call "regeneration." This proposition the writer fortifies by a number of Scripture passages. John iii. 5; Acts ii. 38; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 12; Col. iii. 1; Tit. iii. 5.

3. Baptism, as a sacrament, is an instrument and medium, through which the Holy Ghost conveys to those by whom it is worthily received, spiritual grace.

That Baptism is such an instrument and medium of the Holy Ghost, the writer says, is to be inferred from the frequent connection in the Scriptures of the ideas of baptism with water and with the Spirit. The references are Matt. iii. 11; Acts ii. 38; Acts xix. 5, 6; 1 Cor. xii. 13. He adds: That grace of some sort is conveyed to those who worthily receive baptism is denied only by those, who hold the very lowest view of the sacraments.

Then follows a quotation from Hodge's Theology, Vol. III. p. 589 to the following effect: "Baptism is not only a sign and seal, it is also a means of grace, because in it the blessings which it signifies are conveyed, and the promises of which it is the seal are assured or fulfilled to those who are baptized, provided they believe. Unless the recipient of this sacrament be insincere, baptism is an act of faith, it is an act in which and by which he receives and appropriates the offered benefits of the redemption of Christ."

In the next place, the writer gives us the "conditions in the recipient prerequisite to the administration of baptism, which are the following:

1. Membership in the visible Church.
2. Presumptive Regeneration.
3. Capability of receiving spiritual grace.

The first condition as applicable to infants is established by numerous references to the Old Testament and the New.

In regard to the second, he says: "Baptism, as we have seen, symbolizes regeneration, but *presumptive* regeneration is all that we can predicate of any candidate, whether old or young," and then goes on to show, that "the regeneration of infants is *possible*," that "this moral change wrought by the Holy Ghost is *possible* in the case of children of believers, and that Scripture expressions encourage us to *expect* it." "Facts in the Church favor the belief, that the children of believers are to be presumed to be regenerate till the contrary appears." "All churches that baptize infants do so upon the ground that they may be regenerated in infancy."

The third condition follows from admitting the second; for if infants are capable of being regenerated, as implying a moral change, then they must be capable of receiving spiritual grace. We quote here as highly significant the further comments of the editor of the *Presbyterian Review* on this article.

"We deem the doctrinal aspect of the subject important, because of its practical bearings upon Christian nurture and training. In our view God's covenant TO BE A GOD to our children, and the consequent annexation of the sacramental

seal of His covenanted grace, puts them within the pale of the visible, or presumptive people of God—to whose very position, therefore, it belongs to think and feel, and live and act as the children of God, in all the ways appropriate to their years. They are to be dealt with as those who are not outsiders to the Church, who may not consistently cast their lot with and live like heathens and publicans, until they undergo a conscious, inward transformation, of which they can give a clear account. ‘They are to be taught to pray, to abhor sin, to please God, and to obey the Lord Jesus Christ’ (*Directory for Worship*, Chap. IX), and that any other course is just as recreant to their covenanted privileges and obligations, and place in the Church, as in older persons who have come to the Lord’s Table making a formal profession of religion. Further, agreeably to our Directory just quoted, they are to be taught and trained to have in view the coming to their first communion in the due exercise of faith and repentance, as soon as they reach the period of knowledge and discretion, when they can properly understand the meaning of the act, and take upon themselves its obligations.

It is our full belief, that Christian nurture and training conducted on these principles, would result in saving very many children of the covenant who are now, under a different theory, made to feel that their place and their sympathies are rather ‘in the seat of scorners,’ than in ‘the congregation of the righteous,’ and that a correspondent manner of living befits this position till at some future time they suffer some shock and commotion of soul consciously *ab extra* issuing in conversion. We fear that the effect of placing them virtually in such a conscious attitude is to make multitudes of them more and more aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise, without hope and without God in the world; and that great numbers thus cast upon the dark mountains of sin, are left to wander and stumble to perdition.

On the other hand, we believe, that bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, in accordance with the doctrine and method of our standards, would be so attended

with the presence and inworking of the Holy Spirit, that the manifestations of His sanctifying influence would grow with their growth, and strengthen with their strength; that we should witness multiplying and delightful instances of those sanctified from infancy, yea, even from the womb; that Christian piety would be more ripe, mellow, and symmetrical; that, inwrought into all the springs and habitudes of action through the formative period of life, it would develop into a robust and beautiful prime, making the hoary head a crown of glory; that thus the Church, by a normal development, would prolong and enlarge itself more by internal evolution than external aggregation. It is not indeed to be expected, that children will cease to be children, or that 'young Christians' will be wholly free from the follies of youth, any more than older Christians will be without spot or wrinkle, this side heaven. Nay, many children of the covenant, like many older professors, may prove Christians only in name. 'All are not Israel that are of Israel.' It may, like any other system, be perverted to formalism. With all due allowance for this, we believe that the true conception of infant baptism and church-membership, duly carried out in Christian nurture, would prove an inestimable gain to the cause of religion in the family, the Church and society. It is more nearly realized in the Presbyterianism of Scotland than in this country. In our opinion, it has much to do with the hold which this glorious type of Christianity obtains and retains on all classes of the Scotch people, high and low, rich and poor, from generation to generation. Many of their Churches, under zealous, evangelical pastors, have an almost constant revival, in the continual accession, with devout preparation and intelligent faith, of their baptized children to the Lord's Table.

The ground of infant baptism assigned by Mr. White is largely given in the Reformed theology and symbols, from which our own are largely derived. Thus the first Helvetic Confession gives as a reason for the baptism of infants, that *de eorum electione pie est præsumendum*.

Vitringa says: 'When God hath begun to manifest His grace to the parents, or either of them, we may not presume other-

wise than that He will confer the like grace upon their infants, so long as the contrary does not appear: *Non licet aliter præsumere quam illam leandem gratiam præstiturum infantibus, quamdiu nobis non liquat contrarium.*' For more passages to the same effect from DE MOOR, MARKIUS, WITSIUS, etc., see the little volume issued by our Board, entitled *Children of the Church and Sealing Ordinances*, pp. 101 *et seq.* Dr. Watts says: 'In my opinion, so far as they (infants) are in any way members of the *visible* Church, it is upon *supposition* of their being (with their parents) members of the *invisible* Church of God.' 'Supposition' here is equivalent to 'presumption,' in the sense above."

Criticism.

It will be seen, that this theory goes on the presumption that the children of believers are regenerated in their infancy. The main question in the case for the writer in the *Presbyterian Review* evidently is, whether that great and radical change referred to by our Lord in His discourse with Nicodemus is possible in the case of infants. He presses this point: "There have been many discussions concerning the nature of original sin and the possibility of innate guilt, but the generally received Catholic view always has been, that every soul possesses *a moral character of some kind*, antecedent to its actual conscious choices. Thus by changes wrought in that moral character every soul, even before self-consciousness, is capable of receiving spiritual grace; and infants, when brought by believing parents to the sacrament of baptism, may receive, or may have already received, that promised grace which, in the words of the Westminster Confession, is "not only offered but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto according to the counsel of God's own will in His appointed time."

Just at this point, we take it, is to be found the chief objection to infant baptism. Can infants be regenerated? If they can, then it is easy to see how a rite can be appointed as its sign and seal, a rite which will not be an empty ceremony but a grace-bearing sacrament.

We question whether the idea of regeneration in the Ancient Church, went quite so far as the idea of this writer in the *Presbyterian Review*. He seems to have in his mind something of the modern conception of the moral change wrought in conversion, although he does very properly, in one place, distinguish between the two, when he says: "Regeneration is the work of the Holy Ghost, transforming the soul. It is the divine side of that great change, of which the human side is 'repentance' (*μετάνοια*) or conversion." He does not hesitate to speak of it as a *moral change*, whereas the convention of Bishops assembled in Baltimore several years ago declared, that baptism must not be thought to effect any *moral change*, in which declaration they evidently referred to regeneration in the old Church sense as connected with baptism.

But be this as it may, this Presbyterian theory does not hesitate to say that infants may be regenerated, in the sense of the new birth, or the birth from above, as spoken of by our Lord in His discourse to Nicodemus. It goes further, and says they are to be baptized on the *presumption that they are regenerated*. Some may not be regenerate, but all are presumed to be.

Now the point to be particularly noticed here is, what determines certainly which infants of believing parents are regenerated and which not. This clearly (although now-a-days Presbyterians keep it in the back-ground) is the secret election of God. This comes out in the Westminster Confession, where it says, that in baptism grace is not only offered, but *really exhibited and conferred* by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) *as that grace belongeth unto* ACCORDING TO THE COUNSEL OF GOD'S OWN WILL.

The Presbyterian can go quite as far as the most ultra-Romanist in asserting a regeneration *ex opere operato*, only he asserts it in connection with the abstract will or counsel of God, whereas the Romanist asserts it in connection with a sacrament. We cannot see how the Presbyterian can consistently refute the Roman theory; for if God can regenerate infants by an act of His will, why can He not do it in connection with the

administration of a sacrament? The objection cannot be made against the *ex opere operato* method, but only in applying the grace to *all* infants that are baptized, the Presbyterian allowing it only in the case of elect infants. That is all the difference. And the Romanist has the best of the argument on his side; for according to the Presbyterian theory no man can know certainly that he received any grace in his baptism, because he cannot know whether he is one of the elect.

This is a weak point in Presbyterian theology; for it militates against their assertion also, that all infants dying in infancy are saved. The writer of this article asserts this as his belief. He says, "We believe that *all* children dying in unconscious infancy are saved. They enter heaven only as redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, and as with a moral nature transformed by the power of the Holy Ghost. Their first conscious thought must be in harmony with the will of God, but the great moral change—their regeneration—preceded it while they were still unconscious." Dr. Hodge asserts that this is Presbyterian doctrine. But it is a palpable misrepresentation of Calvinism as bearing on this point, as Dr. Krauth has pointed out by quotations from standard Calvinistic authors.

If the grace of baptism is given only to those "to whom it belongeth according to the counsel of God's own will," and if only "*elect* infants dying in infancy are saved," how can these latter exponents of Calvinism assert, that, according to the teaching of Calvinism all infants dying in infancy are saved? Why then put in the word "*elect*" at all?

But leaving out of the case now this peculiar element in the Presbyterian doctrine of baptism (which lurks under that word "*presumed to be regenerated*"), we hold it to be the main fact, that the children of believing parents are presumed to be regenerated in infancy, and that they are to be baptized on this presumption.

This is a great concession for Presbyterians to make. It requires them, as confessed in the quotation from the Editors given above, to fall back upon the old system of educational religion, which belongs to original Presbyterianism, and was

practiced on when that Church used to keep up catechetical instruction. In later times they have fallen, practically, at least, into the Puritan and Methodist theory of regeneration, which identifies it with conversion.

Do Presbyterians preach this doctrine? Do they say to their baptized members, "You are to presume that you are a regenerate person, and on the basis of this you are to receive the instructions of the Church and become prepared to assume your baptismal vows?" Has it not rather been the effort to bring them to repentance and faith, and on the basis of this to predicate their regeneration as a fact in their lives, which dates from such conscious experience? We are not saying here what should be the character of the address to the baptized, but what it should be on the basis of this Presbyterian theory. It is easy to see, that it is embarrassed by the doctrine of election; for the child must presume, that it is regenerated, provided it has been elected. But inasmuch as the decree of election is secret and unknown, they are to take for granted that they are also of the elect, and to be certain of it when they see the fruits of it in their experience and life. But even with this embarrassment it would be a great matter, if all Presbyterian Churches would make account, even as they used to do, of educational religion and catechetical instruction.

We take issue with this theory when it asserts, that men are to be baptized on the presumption that they *have previously been regenerated*. And we think the article we are criticizing furnishes sufficient evidence to overthrow this assertion. It is the most natural interpretation of the passages of Scripture quoted in the article to understand that the grace signified is actually conferred in baptism, as indeed the Westminster Confession asserts, "Except a man be born of the water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This passage the writer quotes among those referring to baptism. "Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, *and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.*" "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins." "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." These and other passages

seem to connect the reception of the grace with the administration of the sacrament. *There is but one case in the baptisms recorded in the New Testament, in which the communication of the Spirit preceded baptism.* "The communication of the Spirit, and consequently regeneration, in this case (of Cornelius), *before baptism*, is striking, and without parallel in the New Testament. In all other cases, as with the Samaritans, the gift of the Spirit *accompanied* or followed baptism and the laying on of hands." (Dr. Schaff's Hist. Apos. Church, p. 222.)

Why then should this writer reverse this order, and say that the grace which baptism symbolizes is universally conferred before baptism? There is no reason for this. It is unnatural. As well might you say, that it is to be presumed that every one who comes to the Lord's Supper *has* previously received the specific grace connected with the observance of this holy sacrament, and the eating of the bread and drinking of the wine is only a symbol of a transaction already taken place. But we do not do this. Presbyterians do not speak thus of this sacrament. Whatever grace is bestowed is received in connection with the eating and drinking.

This view, that baptism symbolizes a fact or event already consummated is the Baptist theory, which the writer opposes. It comes from an interpretation given to the words, "He that believeth *and* is baptized shall be saved." But if we are to frame a theory from the mere order of the words here, then we should do the same in the words, "Except a man be born of the water *and* the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." We would suppose that the order of the words is as important in the one case as in the other.

Now when we consider, that the writer asserts that the baptism of infants has precisely the same significance as the baptism of adults (on the third page of his article), we ought to conclude that we should follow the order exhibited in the New Testament, and not *vice versa*, as the Baptist theory does. Moreover it is reasonable. If God can regenerate a child before it is baptized, some time between its birth and its baptism, why may He not regenerate it when it is baptized? This would

agree with the use of human *initiatory* rites. An organization that has such a rite makes the administration of the rite and entrance into the organization synchronous. The person may be elected before, and have all the necessary qualifications, but he is not a member until he is initiated.

Then we have the unanimous view of the early Church on this subject, and the idea of a sacrament as held in all ages to support our position. It is not necessary to enlarge on this point. The whole conception of the mysteries of Christianity requires us to hold, that its sacraments are not merely external rites, but signs and seals of grace. And the writer of this article comes to this also in a singular way. His third point in defining the sacrament is, "*Baptism, as a sacrament, is an instrument and medium, through which the Holy Ghost conveys to those by whom it is worthily received spiritual grace.*"

This is a strong statement. It allows all that is claimed by the advocates of baptismal regeneration, so far as the question as to the relation of the outward sign to the inward grace is concerned. The old objection, that the Holy Ghost does not join His activities with the administration of an outward rite, is set aside. A certain kind of grace is conferred in the administration of the sacrament. And the sacrament is "the instrument and medium through which" it is conveyed. We need not question how this can be any more than we need question how God could join the healing of Naaman with his washing seven times in the river Jordan.

But the article leaves us in the dark as to what the specific grace is which is conferred in baptism. According to the writer the grace of regeneration is conferred previous to baptism. Some other grace then is conferred in baptism. What is its character? Is it a confirming and strengthening grace? How then is it distinguished from the grace conferred in partaking of the Lord's Supper? The writer is evidently involved in confusion here. Baptism in the New Testament is spoken of as the sacrament of regeneration. It is called the laver of regeneration. The article says that it symbolizes, and thus has implied reference to, that radical change in the soul that

we commonly call "regeneration." If this be so, why then does the writer make it an immediate and direct sign of some other grace, and refer it only remotely to the grace of regeneration? We can explain this only on the supposition, that he wishes to avoid a certain conclusion. He dreads the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and still more the *ex opere operato* theory. This it is that leads him to avoid the very conclusions to which his premises point.

Our limits do not allow us to extend this criticism. We close with the following remarks.

1. We think the writer aims at the accomplishment of an important purpose, in seeking to point the Presbyterian Church to a better view of baptism, than that it is a mere empty sign. That is what is practically held by a great portion of his Church. The consequence is, that the administration of baptism to infants has come to be sadly neglected in that Church. The General Assembly has repeatedly noticed and lamented the fact. Years ago Dr. Nevin called attention to the fact, that the Presbyterian Church and Puritanism generally, had fallen away from the old Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and he maintained it in a masterly work on "The Mystical Presence," and in a subsequent discussion with Dr. Hodge, who was brought to review his book only by the pressure of a special necessity. Here is a confession that that Church has fallen away also from the old Reformed doctrine of baptism. We hope the article we have criticised, and the words of the Editors of the *Review* in which it appeared, may serve to call attention to the fact.

2. The Reformed doctrine of baptism which joins the grace of regeneration (in the old Church sense of regeneration,—not the modern which confounds it with conversion) with the application of water in the administration of the sacrament of baptism, is not, by any means, the Roman doctrine. The Roman doctrine of natural depravity, or the state of the child by birth, is very different from the Protestant doctrine. And the Roman theory, that baptism places the subject in a state of innocence, completes the work, so that he need only to watch and guard against a fall from that state of innocence, and if he fall to seek restoration again in the sacrament of Penance, is widely different from the Protestant conception, that baptism is only the foundation and beginning of a growth in which sanctification is realized. But we cannot dwell further upon this point now.

RECENT PUBLICATION.

LIBRARY OF CHOICE FICTION. "May," by Mrs. Oliphant, Author of "At His Gates," "Chronicles of Carlingford," "Miss Majoribanks," &c., &c. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway, New York.

PATER MUNDI; OR, DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION. Being in substance Lectures delivered in various Colleges and Theological Seminaries. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., author of "Ecce Caelum" and "Ad Fidem," and lecturer on the scientific evidences of religion, in Amherst College. Boston: Noyes, Holmes and Company, No. 117 Washington Street. 1873.

THE HOLY BIBLE, ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORIZED VERSION (A. D. 1611,) WITH AN EXPLANATORY AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY AND A REVISION OF THE TRANSLATION. By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. II. Joshua.—1 Kings. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway. 1873.

This is what has been known as The Speaker's Commentary, because it was entered upon, if we mistake not, at the suggestion of the Speaker of the House of Commons. The volume before us is admirably brought out by Scribner, Armstrong & Co. The binding is rich, plain, and substantial. The paper and type are of a quality in keeping with the character of the work. Altogether it is a volume pleasant to the eye, and an ornament as well as an addition to the library.

A stupendous work is being done in our day in the way of bringing out the wealth of the Sacred Scriptures. The advanced views that have come to be entertained in regard to these Scriptures, according to which, while their inspiration is firmly maintained, the human factor in them is more fully recognized, have conduced to add new interest to their critical study. The attacks made upon them also by modern infidelity, has induced new investigation, so that altogether the conditions are at hand for such a study of the Bible as has never been devoted to it in any preceding age.

This Speaker's Commentary will circulate most largely in England. But the enterprising Publishing House that has undertaken to bring it out in this country has no doubt calculated with good assurance on a wide circulation also in this country. It is not as voluminous as Lange's Commentary, but it contains just such helps and explanations as the reader needs, without being cumbered with

learning. For the general reader of the Scriptures it is a valuable help, and its investigations and criticisms are made in the light of the most advanced Biblical scholarship.

THE REFORMATION. By George P. Fisher, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, in Yale College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873.


Elsewhere in this REVIEW we have made this work the occasion for expressing a few thoughts on the general subject of Theological Science in America. We add here, that our examination of the work has produced a favorable impression in reference to its ability and clearness of style. It reveals ability, for it is the production of one who has studied well his theme. The list of works on the Reformation given in Appendix II., covering twenty-five pages, shows the varied material which the author has consulted and from which he has gathered. Appendix I. contains a valuable chronological table. But while the work reveals ability, and its method is clear, and style excellent, it has some defects. The Lutherans will not be quite satisfied with the author's statement, that Luther's view was that there are two substances in the sacrament, or consubstantiation. The German Reformed may justly complain, that Prof. Fisher has entirely ignored the rise of the Reformed Church in the Palatinate. Surely this is quite as important as the rise of the Reformed Church in Geneva or in France, to which chapters are devoted. There seems also to be a want of appreciation of the central and fundamental significance of the Sacramental controversy, and in a few points not the best statement of the different views that entered into the controversy.

But we could not expect everything, even of importance, connected with the Reformation to be brought into the compass of one volume.

YEAR-BOOK OF NATURE AND POPULAR SCIENCE FOR 1872.

Edited by John C. Draper, M. D., Professor of History and Physiology in the College of the City of New York, and of Chemistry in the University Medical College. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 1873.

A volume gathering up the results of the progress of science, more particularly natural science, during the past year. It comprises general sections or heads, on 1. Mathematical and Physical Science; 2. Chemistry; 3. Geology; 4. Social Science; 5. General Biology; 6. Mechanical Science. It is properly called a Year-Book. Every one, who wishes to keep posted in the new things of Science, and to become acquainted with many valuable hints in regard to them, will seek to get this book. It is brought out in handsome style.

 The above Notices were crowded out of the last number of the REVIEW; which fact accounts for this late insertion.



Rev. J. G. Apple
VOL. VII.

NEW SERIES.

NO. 1.

3
THE
Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

THOS. G. APPLE, D. D.

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia
in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XX.

JANUARY, 1873.

PHILADELPHIA:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD
54 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

JAS E. RODGERS Co., PRINTERS.

CONTENTS OF JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
<p>I. INFIDELITY—ITS PRINCIPLES.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. D. Y. Heisler, A. M., Mont Alto, Pa.</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>II. THE CRISIS IN THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE CRESCENT AND THE CROSS.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. John I. Swander, A. M., Latrobe, Pa.</p>	<p>28</p>
<p>III. THE NATURALNESS OF CHRISTIANITY.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. J. W. Steinmetz, Danville, Pa.</p>	<p>44</p>
<p>IV. THE MISSION OF PHILOSOPHY.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Alexander Harris, Lancaster, Pa.</p>	<p>61</p>
<p>V. WOMAN'S CULTURE.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev J. H. Dubbs, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa.</p>	<p>78</p>
<p>VI. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL MOVEMENT IN ITS RELATION TO THE CAUSE OF EDUCATIONAL RELIGION.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. J. Spangler Kieffer, Hagerstown, Md.</p>	<p>92</p>
<p>VII. CONSCIENCE AND THE VATICAN.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. J. S. Stahr.</p>	<p>117</p>
<p>VIII. REGENERATION AND CONVERSION.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. Wm. Rupp, A. M., Berlin, Pa.</p>	<p>140</p>
<p>IX. THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN.</p>	<p>172</p>
<p>X. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.</p>	<p>175</p>

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD.

OUR STORE.

NEW BOOKS.

The Reformed Church Publication Board have just published several New Books, for the Sunday School or Private Library, viz:

ROGATIAN,	75cts.	EASTER EGGS,	45cts.
YOUTH IN EARNEST,	90cts.	LIFE OF CAIN,	75cts.
THE RIPE HARVEST,	50cts.	GOOD FRIDAY,	40cts.
FATHER MILLER,	75cts.	CREED AND CUSTOMS,	\$2.00.
SALOME, THE DANCER,	40cts.	SINAI AND ZION,	\$2.00.
HARBAUGH'S HARFE,	\$1.00 & 1.25.	LEO REMBRANDT,	90cts.

CHRISTIAN HOLY-DAY STORIES, 50cts.

TRUE GLORY OF WOMAN, \$1.25.

THE OLD SCHOOLMASTER, 90cts.

ALICE AND HER LITTLE SCHOOL 30 cts.

THREE CHRISTMAS EVES, \$1.50

GOSPEL LESSONS AND EPISTLE LESSONS,

Arranged according to the Church Year, 50cts. each.

Any of which will be sent, postpaid, to any address, on receipt of the retail price.

Send on your orders, and address—

THE REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

54 North 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harbaugh's Harfe.

THE POPULAR POEMS

WRITTEN BY THE LATE DR. HARBAUGH IN

PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN,

Edited by REV. B. BAUSMAN, D. D., and Illustrated with six fine Engravings of Dr. Harbaugh's early home, the "Alt Schul Haus an der Krick," etc., has been issued by the Reformed Church Publication Board in a beautiful octavo volume, at \$1.50, sent by mail at the above price. Address:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

54 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia.

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The "MERCERSBURG REVIEW" was commenced in January 1849. In 1853 its name was changed to "MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY." In 1857 the old name was restored, and under that title it was issued up to the close of 1861, when its publication was suspended.

After its suspension a growing desire for its re-issue was repeatedly expressed from various directions. It was felt that the earnest questions it so vigorously discussed in former years, were neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues also continued to press upon the Church from all sides. The specific work of the REVIEW was not yet done. Hence, resuming the old title, its re-issue commenced in January, 1867, with the purpose that, as far as possible, it shall in character, life, and spirit, be a continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The design of the REVIEW is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the REVIEW regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of Humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost: the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the REVIEW will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The REVIEW appreciates at the same time the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology during the last quarter of a century in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserves the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the REVIEW will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The REVIEW will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn practical character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, whilst this REVIEW proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far as possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

The REVIEW is edited by the Rev. Thos. G. Apple, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., assisted by other eminent writers of the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly; in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

For two year's subscription, FIVE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

POSTAGE.—The postage is three cents per number, or twelve cents per year to any part of the United States.

The numbers will be sent as first ordered, until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address. Missing numbers will be supplied only when notice is given within the quarter for which the number is missing, but not to those who change their residence without giving notice of the change PREVIOUS to the appointed time of publication, viz: the first of January, April, July, and October.

Orders for the REVIEW, with remittances, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

54 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notices, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the Editor, at Lancaster, Pa.

VOL. VII.

NEW SERIES.

NO. 2.

THE
Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

THOS. G. APPLE, D. D.

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnis
in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XX.

APRIL, 1873.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
No. 907 ARCH STREET.

JAS B. RODGERS Co., PRINTERS.

CONTENTS OF APRIL NUMBER.

ARTICLE	PAGE
I. THE ROMAN QUESTION. - - - -	181
II. FIRST DOGMATIC DECREE ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST PUBLISHED IN THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE HOLY ŒCUMENICAL COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN. - -	191
III. DR. DÖLLINGER'S REPLY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF MUNICH. - - - - -	199
Translated by Prof. J. S. Stahr, A. M.	
IV. THE GERMAN BISHOPS AS WITNESSES OF THE TRUTH. - - - - -	213
Translated from the German, by the Rev. E. W. Reinecke, Nazareth, Pa.	
V. THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT. - - -	240
By President J. Williamson Nevin, D. D.	
VI. DOES A DIVINE CURSE REST UPON THE WORLD?	295
VII. THE TENDENCY OF INDIVIDUALISM IN THE GERMAN CHURCHES IN AMERICA. -	302
By Rev. I. E. Graeff.	
VIII. THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE IN AMERICA. - -	317

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD.

OUR STORE.

NEW BOOKS.

The Reformed Church Publication Board have just published several New Books, for the Sunday School or Private Library, viz:

ROGATIAN,	75cts.	EASTER EGGS,	45cts.
YOUTH IN EARNEST,	90cts.	LIFE OF CAIN,	75cts.
THE RIPE HARVEST,	50cts.	GOOD FRIDAY,	40cts.
FATHER MILLER,	75cts.	CRED AND CUSTOMS,	\$2.00.
SALOME, THE DANCER,	40cts.	SINAI AND ZION,	\$2.00.
HARBAUGH'S HARFE,	\$1.00 & 1.25.	LEO REMBRANDT,	90cts.

CHRISTIAN HOLY-DAY STORIES, 50cts.

TRUE GLORY OF WOMAN, \$1.25.

THE OLD SCHOOLMASTER, 90cts.

ALICE AND HER LITTLE SCHOOL 30 cts.

THREE CHRISTMAS EVES, \$1.50

GOSPEL LESSONS AND EPISTLE LESSONS,

Arranged according to the Church Year, 50cts. each.

Any of which will be sent, postpaid, to any address, on receipt of the retail price.

Send on your orders, and address—

THE REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harbaugh's Harfe.

THE POPULAR POEMS

WRITTEN BY THE LATE DR. HARBAUGH IN

PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN,

Edited by REV. B. BAUSMAN, D. D., and Illustrated with six fine Engravings of Dr. Harbaugh's early home, the "Alt Schul Haus an der Krick," etc., has been issued by the Reformed Church Publication Board in a beautiful octavo volume, at \$1.50, sent by mail at the above price. Address:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The "MERCERSBURG REVIEW" was commenced in January 1849. In 1853 its name was changed to "MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY." In 1857 the old name was restored, and under that title it was issued up to the close of 1861, when its publication was suspended.

After its suspension a growing desire for its re-issue was repeatedly expressed from various directions. It was felt that the earnest questions it so vigorously discussed in former years, were neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues also continued to press upon the Church from all sides. The specific work of the REVIEW was not yet done. Hence, resuming the old title, its re-issue commenced in January, 1867, with the purpose that, as far as possible, it shall in character, life, and spirit, be a continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The design of the REVIEW is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the REVIEW regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of Humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost; the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the REVIEW will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The REVIEW appreciates at the same time the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology during the last quarter of a century in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserves the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the REVIEW will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The REVIEW will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn practical character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, whilst this REVIEW proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far as possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

The REVIEW is edited by the Rev. Thos. G. Apple, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., assisted by other eminent writers of the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly; in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

For two year's subscription, FIVE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

POSTAGE.—The postage is three cents per number, or twelve cents per year to any part of the United States.

The numbers will be sent as first ordered, until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address. Missing numbers will be supplied only when notice is given within the quarter for which the number is missing, but not to those who change their residence without giving notice of the change PREVIOUS to the appointed time of publication, viz: the first of January, April, July, and October.

Orders for the REVIEW, with remittances, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the Editor, at Lancaster, Pa.

t
l
f
e
r
g
e
e
of
n

re
to
or
en
ed

a.
led
be

②

VOL. VII.

NEW SERIES.

NO. 3.

THE
Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

THOS. G. APPLE, D. D.

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

*Veni Christe Juxta dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia
In semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRVING.*

VOLUME XX.

JULY, 1873.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
No. 907 ARCH STREET.

JAS B. RODGERS CO., PRINTERS.

CONTENTS OF JULY NUMBER.

ARTICLE	PAGE
<p>I. CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. - - - -</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Rev. J. O. Miller, D. D., York, Pa.</p>	<p>325</p>
<p>II. FAITH—NORMAL AND ABNORMAL. - -</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Rev. C. Z. Weiser, Pennsburg, Pa.</p>	<p>346</p>
<p>III. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH - - -</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Rev. Samuel Miller, Philadelphia.</p>	<p>366</p>
<p>IV. THE FALL AND ITS IMPORT. - - -</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Rev. D. F. Brendle, A. M., Bethlehem, Pa.</p>	<p>376</p>
<p>V. THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL IN ITS RELATION TO THE CHURCH. - - - - -</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Rev. J. W. Santee, Cavetown, Md.</p>	<p>391</p>
<p>VI. THE LESSONS OF THE CHURCH YEAR NOT A PERVERSION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. -</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By the Rev. F. V. Gerhart, D. D.</p>	<p>422</p>
<p>VII. THE STUDY OF METHOD IN MODERN CHURCH HISTORY! - - - - -</p>	<p>431</p>
<p>VIII. THE STARRY HEAVENS. - - - -</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">By Prof. Theodore Appel, D. D.</p>	<p>451</p>
<p>IX. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. - - - -</p>	<p>468</p>

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD.

OUR STORE.

NEW BOOKS.

The Reformed Church Publication Board have just published several New Books, for the Sunday School or Private Library, viz:

ROGATIAN,	75cts.	EASTER EGGS,	45cts.
YOUTH IN EARNEST,	90cts.	LIFE OF CAIN,	75cts.
THE RIPE HARVEST,	50cts.	GOOD FRIDAY,	40cts.
FATHER MILLER,	75cts.	CREED AND CUSTOMS,	\$2.00.
SALOME, THE DANCER,	40cts.	SINAI AND ZION,	\$2.00.
HARBAUGH'S HARFE,	\$1.00 & 1.25.	LEO REMBRANDT,	90cts.

CHRISTIAN HOLY-DAY STORIES, 50cts.

TRUE GLORY OF WOMAN, \$1.25.

THE OLD SCHOOLMASTER, 90cts.

ALICE AND HER LITTLE SCHOOL 30 cts.

THREE CHRISTMAS EVES, \$1.50

GOSPEL LESSONS AND EPISTLE LESSONS,

Arranged according to the Church Year, 50cts. each.

Any of which will be sent, postpaid, to any address, on receipt of the retail price.

Send on your orders, and address—

THE REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harbaugh's Harfe.

THE POPULAR POEMS

WRITTEN BY THE LATE DR. HARBAUGH IN

PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN,

Edited by REV. B. BAUSMAN, D. D., and Illustrated with six fine Engravings of Dr. Harbaugh's early home, the "Alt Schul Haus an der Krick," etc., has been issued by the Reformed Church Publication Board in a beautiful octavo volume, at \$1.50, sent by mail at the above price. Address:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The "MERCERSBURG REVIEW" was commenced in January 1849. In 1853 its name was changed to "MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY." In 1857 the old name was restored, and under that title it was issued up to the close of 1861, when its publication was suspended.

After its suspension a growing desire for its re-issue was repeatedly expressed from various directions. It was felt that the earnest questions it so vigorously discussed in former years, were neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues also continued to press upon the Church from all sides. The specific work of the REVIEW was not yet done. Hence, resuming the old title, its re-issue commenced in January, 1867, with the purpose that, as far as possible, it shall in character, life, and spirit, be a continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The design of the REVIEW is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the REVIEW regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of Humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost: the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the REVIEW will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The REVIEW appreciates at the same time the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology during the last quarter of a century in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserves the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the REVIEW will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The REVIEW will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn practical character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, whilst this REVIEW proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far as possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

The REVIEW is edited by the Rev. Thos. G. Apple, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., assisted by other eminent writers of the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly; in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

For two year's subscription, FIVE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

POSTAGE.—The postage is three cents per number, or twelve cents per year to any part of the United States.

The numbers will be sent as first ordered, until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address. Missing numbers will be supplied only when notice is given within the quarter for which the number is missing, but not to those who change their residence without giving notice of the change previous to the appointed time of publication, viz: the first of January, April, July, and October.

Orders for the REVIEW, with remittances, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the Editor, at Lancaster, Pa.

Rev J G Apple

VOL. VII.

NEW SERIES.

NO. 4.

THE
Mercersburg Review;

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY
THOS. G. APPLE, D. D.

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LANCASTER, PA.

*Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia
in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENEUS.*

VOLUME XX.

OCTOBER, 1873.

PHILADELPHIA:
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
No. 907 ARCH STREET.

JAS. B. RODGERS CO., PRINTERS.

CONTENTS OF OCTOBER NUMBER.

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
I. CHRISTIANITY AND HUMANITY. - - -	469
By Pres. J. Williamson Nevin, D. D., LL. D.	
II. SCRIPTURE VIEW OF DIVINE WORSHIP. -	487
By Rev. D. Y. Heisler, A. M., Mt. Alto, Pa.	
III. THE SCOPE AND SPIRIT OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.	522
By W. Leaman, Esq., Lancaster, Pa.	
IV. THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM AS TAUGHT IN THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM. - - -	537
By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D.	
V. DALTON ON THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM. -	573
By Rev. F. K. Levan, A. M.	
VI. THE UNION OF THE DIVINE AND HUMAN IN JESUS CHRIST. - - - - -	583
By Dr. L. Schœberlin, Prof. and Consistorialrath in Gottingen.	
VII. THE PRESBYTERIAN THEORY OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. - - - - -	628
VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. - - - -	639

"BEST PERIODICAL IN AMERICA."—Rev. Dr. Cuyler.



Prof. Max Muller, Prof. Tyndall, Prof. Huxley, Lord Lytton, Fritz Reuter, Mrs. Oliphant, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, Charles Kingsley, Erckmann-Chatrian, Ivan Turguenieff, Matthew Arnold, Julia Kavanagh, W. E. H. Lecky, Miss Thackeray, Wm. Black, Arthur Helps, Miss Muloch, Richard A. Proctor, Katharine C. Macquoid, Jean Ingelow, The Duke of Argyll, Mrs. Parr, Edward A. Freeman, Karl Blind, Alfred Russell Wallace, Francis Galton, Christina G. Rossetti, Geo. MacDonald, Froude, and Gladstone, are some of the eminent authors lately represented in the pages of



LITTELL'S LIVING AGE.

A weekly magazine, of sixty-four pages, THE LIVING AGE gives more than **THREE AND A QUARTER THOUSAND** double-column octavo pages of reading-matter yearly, forming four large volumes. It presents in an inexpensive form, considering its great amount of matter, with freshness, owing to its weekly issue, and with a *satisfactory completeness* attempted by no other publication, the best Essays, Reviews, Criticisms, Tales, Poetry, Scientific, Biographical, Historical, and Political Information, from the entire body of Foreign Periodical Literature.

A **NEW SERIES** was begun Jan. 1, 1873. With it were begun entirely new tales, already embracing one serial by Mrs. Oliphant; one by MM. Erckmann-Chatrian, the distinguished French novelists; one by Fritz Reuter, the popular German author; one by the celebrated Bulwer (Lord Lytton); one by Mrs. Parr, author of the charming "Dorothy Fox;" and shorter stories by the eminent Russian novelist, Ivan Turguenieff, the pleasant English writers, Miss Thackeray, Julia Kavanagh, &c.

During the coming year, as heretofore, serial and short stories by the **Leading Foreign Authors** will be given, together with an amount

Unapproached by any other Periodical in the world, of the best and most valuable literary and scientific matter of the day, from the pens of the above-named and many other

FOREMOST ESSAYISTS, SCIENTISTS, CRITICS, DISCOVERERS, AND EDITORS, representing every department of Knowledge and Progress.

The importance of THE LIVING AGE to every American reader, as the only **complete** as well as fresh compilation of a generally inaccessible but indispensable current literature,—*indispensable* because it embraces the productions of

The Ablest Living Writers

in all branches of Literature, Science, Art, and Politics,—is sufficiently indicated by the following

OPINIONS.

"Year by year those who wish to keep themselves informed in the literature of the day, come more generally to recognize THE LIVING AGE as the best means for attaining that end; while the reach of persons of moderate leisure. . . . It would be hard indeed to find in the same compass elsewhere as much of wit, learning, and information, reproducing as it does, the best thoughts of the best minds of the civilized world, upon all topics of living interest."—**Philadelphia Inquirer.**

"It is beyond all question the best compendium of the best current literature."—**N.Y. Evening Post.**

"Its pages term with the choicest literature of the day."—**New-York Tribune.**

"It still merits the most unqualified praise we can bestow."—**New-York Times.**

"It is incomparable in the richness, variety, and sterling worth of its articles, and equal to several ordinary magazines in the amount of matter presented."—**The Standard, Chicago.**

"The best of all the eclectic publications, and the cheapest. . . . It is a monthly that comes every week."—**The Advance, Chicago.**

"The ablest essays, the most entertaining stories, the finest poetry of the English language, are here gathered together."—**Illinois State Journal.**

"It gives articles from the great foreign quarterlies which its rivals have not room for. It also gives the best serial stories. . . . It has no equal in any country."—**Philadelphia Press.**

THE LIVING AGE is sent a year (fifty-two numbers) *postage paid*, on receipt of \$3.00. An extra copy sent gratis to any one getting up a club of five new subscribers.

EXTRA OFFERS FOR 1874.

To new subscribers now remitting \$3.00 for the year 1874, the last six numbers of 1873 will be sent *gratis*; or, to those wishing to begin with the NEW SERIES, the numbers of the two years, 1873 and 1874 (104 numbers), will be sent for \$13.00; or, to those preferring, the publishers make the following

CLUB PRICES FOR THE BEST HOME AND FOREIGN LITERATURE.

"[Possessed of 'LITTELL'S LIVING AGE' and of one or other of our vigorous American monthlies, a subscriber will find himself in command of the whole situation]"—**Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.**
For ten dollars, THE LIVING AGE and either one of the American four dollar monthly Magazines (or Harper's Weekly or Bazar, or Appleton's Journal, weekly), will be sent for a year; or, for \$9.00 THE LIVING AGE and SCRIBNER'S St Nicholas; or, for \$8.50, THE LIVING AGE and Our Young Folks.

ADDRESS

LITTELL AND GAY, 17 Bromfield St., Boston.

THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The "MERCERSBURG REVIEW" was commenced in January 1849. In 1853 its name was changed to "MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY." In 1857 the old name was restored, and under that title it was issued up to the close of 1861, when its publication was suspended.

After its suspension a growing desire for its re-issue was repeatedly expressed from various directions. It was felt that the earnest questions it so vigorously discussed in former years, were neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues also continued to press upon the Church from all sides. The specific work of the REVIEW was not yet done. Hence, resuming the old title, its re-issue commenced in January, 1867, with the purpose that, as far as possible, it shall in character, life, and spirit, be a continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The design of the REVIEW is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the REVIEW regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of Humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost; the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the REVIEW will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The REVIEW appreciates at the same time the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology during the last quarter of a century in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserves the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the REVIEW will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The REVIEW will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn practical character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, whilst this REVIEW proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far as possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

The REVIEW is edited by the Rev. Thos. G. Apple, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., assisted by other eminent writers of the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly; in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

For two year's subscription, FIVE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

POSTAGE.—The postage is three cents per number, or twelve cents per year to any part of the United States.

The numbers will be sent as first ordered, until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address. Missing numbers will be supplied only when notice is given within the quarter for which the number is missing, but not to those who change their residence without giving notice of the change PREVIOUS to the appointed time of publication, viz: the first of January, April, July, and October.

Orders for the REVIEW, with remittances, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

907 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the Editor, at Lancaster, Pa.

